

# CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD  
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,  
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Divinity School,  
University of Chicago*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,  
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-  
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Meadville Theo-  
logical School*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke  
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-  
logical Seminary*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological  
Seminary*)

JOHN DILLENBERGER (*Divinity School,  
Harvard University*)

EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (*McCormick  
Theological Seminary*)

VOL. XXIV

DECEMBER, 1956

No. 4

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A HISTORIAN'S APPROACH TO THEOLOGY <i>Willis B. Glover</i>	291
ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM IN THE PURITAN REVOLUTION <i>Leo F. Solt</i>	306
FROM COERCION TO PERSUASION: ANOTHER LOOK AT THE RISE OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND THE EMERGENCE OF DENOMINATIONALISM <i>Sidney E. Mead</i>	317
HIRSCH'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY <i>G. Wayne Glick</i>	338
SURVEYS OF RECENT LITERATURE	362
ANCIENT CHURCH HISTORY .....	Robert Grant
FIVE YEARS OF LITERATURE ON PROTESTANT MISSIONS .....	R. Pierce Beaver
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS	372

# CONTENTS

## BOOK REVIEWS

375

MILLER, W. J., S. J. AND BUTLER, H. E., EDs., REVISED BY BROOKE,  
C. N. L.: *The Letters of John of Salisbury. Vol. One: The Early  
Letters (1153-1161)* ..... Ray C. Petry

TAPPERT, THEODORE G., ED.: *Luther: Letters of Spiritual Counsel.*  
(Vol. XVIII: *The Library of Christian Classics*) ..... Lewis W. Spitz

GILL, FREDERICK C., ED.: *Selected Letters of John Wesley* .. David C. Shipley

LIGOU, DANIEL, ED.: *Documents sur le Protestantisme montalbanais  
au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* ..... Burdette C. Poland

GRAY, ELMA E. AND GRAY, LESLIE ROBB: *Wilderness Christians:  
The Moravian Mission to the Delaware Indians* ..... Glenn Weaver

JOHNSON, CHARLES A.: *The Frontier Camp Meeting, Religion's  
Harvest Time* ..... W. E. Garrison

SMITH, H. SHELTON: *Changing Conceptions of Original Sin:  
A Study in American Theology since 1750* ..... Sydney E. Ahlstrom

LEWIS, R. W. B.: *The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy and  
Tradition in the Nineteenth Century* ..... Sydney E. Ahlstrom

## A HISTORIAN'S APPROACH TO THEOLOGY

### THEOLOGY'S ROLE IN HISTORY

WILLIS B. GLOVER, *Mercer University*

Basil Willey in the introductory chapter of his *Seventeenth Century Background* calls attention to the fact that the rise of scientific humanism introduced a basic dichotomy into the intellectual and religious life of that century.<sup>1</sup> A new pattern of explanation came to dominate Western thought in the seventeenth century, and it was destined to continue without being effectively challenged until the twentieth. For three centuries it was assumed that reality was a closed system of law, and no explanation was satisfactory which did not make clear the efficient causation operating within this closed system. Epistemological studies, to be sure, developed within this period a radical skepticism regarding the validity of man's knowledge of ultimate reality; but not even Hume or Kant succeeded in conceiving of reality as essentially dynamic. The early nineteenth century witnessed a reaction against the static rationalism of the previous age. Emphasis came to be put on movement, development, evolution. Things were explained, not by direct relation to a nexus of fixed laws, but by descriptions of how they came to be.

Nevertheless, the underlying assumption remained that the reality in which evolution took place was a closed system of law. It is significant that the very word which Lovejoy used to describe the static conception of reality in the eighteenth century — the word "uniformitarianism"<sup>2</sup> — was first coined by geologists to designate the basic principle that the laws which determine the evolutionary development of the earth's crust are the same in all ages.

The significance of Hume's skepticism scarcely penetrated the general culture of the nineteenth century. The world remained on the whole a rational system of order which man optimistically expected to know and control for his own purposes. Schemes of social reform from the Manchester school on one hand to Marxism on the other had pretensions of scientific validity that rooted them in a comfortably stable reality. Even the Prometheanism of the age in its most widely pervasive forms was founded on confidence in man's scientific prowess.

These illusions of a comfortable and controllable reality have been dispelled in our age. Not for everyone, it is true; the nineteenth century still lives on in Julian Huxley and many others. But it is Aldous Huxley rather than Julian who typifies his age. The compelling questions of our time are no longer scientific questions but questions of meaning and significance. Huxley's *Brave New World* is not merely satirizing the ideal of a scientifically controlled society; it raises the more funda-

mental question of the meaning of human life and exposes the inadequacy of any utilitarian answer. How many novels have been written in recent decades in which the problem is: How can anyone know anyone else or be known of him?<sup>3</sup> The following lines from Thomas Wolfe express a pervasive theme:

Naked and alone we came into exile.  
In her dark womb  
We did not know our mother's face;  
From the prison of her flesh have we come  
Into the unspeakable and incommunicable prison  
Of this earth.

Which of us has known his brother?  
Which of us has looked into his father's heart?  
Which of us has not remained forever prison-pent?  
Which of us is not forever a stranger and alone?<sup>4</sup>

The mystery of man's need for community and his tragic incapacity to achieve it is a basic concern of the age. T. S. Eliot and Robinson Jeffers, widely divergent in religious and social orientation, yet raise much the same questions, questions to which no scientific answer would be relevant; and from their almost opposite perspectives they level a caustic criticism at the shallowness of our scientific, humanistic culture.

In philosophy the logical positivists have so narrowed the area of valid knowledge as to leave us no alternative but to walk by faith; and existentialists have reversed the orientation of philosophy and affirmed the inscrutable mystery of the reality that confronts us as existents. In the twentieth century even the scientists have been writing books with such titles as *The Mysterious Universe* and *The Limitations of Science*.<sup>5</sup> The atom bomb has become the popular symbol of the limitations of a merely scientific culture. But it is only a symbol. The cultural crisis antedated the bomb and would have overtaken us if neither world war had occurred.

An intellectual revolution is in progress and all fields of scholarship are involved. There is an open-endedness about our world, a sense that reality transcends all our efforts at understanding, an awe which borders on despair as there are revealed at work in the history of our time dynamic forces which we are not able to control and which threaten the existence of all structures which we have built up. In this crisis of the total culture, Christian faith is found to have a new relevance, and Christian theology for the first time in three centuries occupies a position of leadership in intellectual life.

During the preceding three centuries, when reality was conceived as a closed system of order, some of the most basic Christian insights into human experience could not be expressed in a manner convincing to the mind of the age. Christians had inherited a tradition in which a sovereign God acts in both nature and history, and in which



history is distinguished from nature by the freedom of man to respond to God's activity. As the seventeenth century drew to a close, it became increasingly difficult to make this Christian tradition articulate within a climate of opinion too restricted for its adequate expression. Generally speaking, theologians reacted to this situation in two mutually exclusive ways.<sup>6</sup> Aware of a reality transcending any system of natural laws, they superimposed on the natural order a supernatural order in which God still exercised an active sovereignty and spiritual beings in the created world found scope for their freedom as spirits. Man, of course, was involved in both nature and supernature. The new distinction between two orders of being tended to supersede the traditional Hebrew-Christian distinction between God and Creation. The relation of nature to supernature was not clearly conceived. Leslie Stephen points out a tendency of eighteenth-century English Christians to combine Wesley's point of view of the first century with Hume's view of the eighteenth;<sup>7</sup> but, of course, none of them achieved such a feat with thorough-going consistency. Emphasis upon the supernatural had the effect of driving a wedge between Christian thought and the general intellectual life of the modern world.

The theological alternative was to accept the dominant assumptions of the age and to explain Christianity in terms of them. Efforts were made in the eighteenth century to demonstrate the truth of Christianity by showing it to be rational;<sup>8</sup> and similar efforts in the nineteenth century pointed out that, after all, Christianity had evolved much like other religions and was subject to the same kind of historical description and analysis.

The weakness of the liberal theology that resulted from a rigorous accommodation to modern intellectual currents was that it involved the denial of basic Christian insights and left the theologian without any witness to the culture from which he had borrowed all that he had to say.<sup>9</sup> Actually it was rare that anybody who regarded himself a Christian followed either of the alternatives I have described to the utter exclusion of the other. Both expedients were resorted to by most, who thus added to the weaknesses of each the contradictions between the two.

The history of theology must not, of course, be equated with the history of religious faith. The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries saw revivals of both Evangelical and Catholic Christianity, but these revivals suffered from a theological failure to articulate the faith to the intellectual life of the times. Liberal Protestantism, on the other hand, produced no comparable religious movements and had much less effect upon political and social history;<sup>10</sup> but it was more respectable intellectually, and, inspired by the prevailing climate of opinion, made enduring contributions to church history and biblical

studies. During the last three centuries the Christian tradition has continued to exercise an incalculable influence in its wide diffusion through the total culture of the West, and religious movements of great power have had decisive effects upon many aspects of Western history. Even so, one has to say that during the same period Christian theology as such has been a negligible influence on the development of Western thought.

This situation has now radically changed. The contemporary revival of theology is associated with the breakdown of the orderly world of scientific humanism.<sup>11</sup> The causes of this breakdown are many and their operation is obscure, but there is a depth in the Western tradition which has in our day asserted itself successfully against the shallow optimism of the previous age.<sup>12</sup> A new sense of the mystery of human life and community has permeated all aspects of our culture and is particularly strong in intellectual circles. Growing interest in the problem of community has revealed a deeper common ground between history and theology in the fact that both are concerned with man in his freedom. The same transcendent freedom which renders man a religious animal is also that which makes him the creator of community and history.<sup>13</sup> As long as there was a compelling authority about the assumption that reality is a closed system of order, the implications of human freedom could hardly be made intelligible in our culture. But the contemporary crisis has opened the way to a creative interchange between history and theology. Both, of course, have had a prominent part in the undermining of a narrowly scientific view of reality. Historians have increasingly recognized the impossibility of a scientific history, for human freedom renders all historical predictions uncertain; and the difficulties of prediction cast a doubt upon the adequacy of any causal sequences as explanations of what has already occurred. Theologians, on the other hand, have helped to make articulate deeper Christian insights into the meaning of existence. What had been anticipated as a post-Christian era begins to look more like a post-scientific age. I do not mean, of course, that science is at all likely to be abandoned or even to slacken its pace in the rational organization of empirical knowledge; but its assumptions no longer dominate our intellectual life, and our most pressing problems do not raise scientific questions.

As one will recognize, the picture I have sketched is much too simple. Actually, no new cultural pattern has clearly emerged, and our thought is still confused by the incompleteness of our emancipation from the narrow perspectives of the last three hundred years. There is still some tendency of historians to understand modern history as a simple evolutionary progress. This pattern of interpretation is not without its truth. The unidirectional nature of history which it

presupposes is an inheritance from the Hebrew-Christian tradition and is substantiated by our growing knowledge of prehistoric man. Even Reinhold Niebuhr recognizes the reality of progress, not merely in technical proficiency but in enlarging the area of human freedom.<sup>14</sup> The simple pattern of liberal humanism needs, however, to be deepened by Niebuhr's understanding of the moral ambiguity of every forward step and the Christian realization that perfect community cannot result from perfecting our arrangements of self-interest.

The theologians, on their side, also give evidence that their emancipation is not complete. Bultmann's effort to demythologize the New Testament is frankly motivated by the desire to reconcile the Gospel with a scientific view of the world which assumes an order in which the causal sequence of events constitutes a closed system—an order which is assumed to be so well known that unusual events are considered incredible as observable phenomena unless they can be explained in terms of general laws.<sup>15</sup> History, in so far as it is an observable phenomenon, is also considered by Bultmann to be bound within the limits of general laws.<sup>16</sup> Does not his distinction between historical and eschatological, between cosmic events and historical events, introduce a new and perhaps more sophisticated dualism, which, like the dualism between natural and supernatural, reserves an area in which revelation and faith can occur without disturbing the order of nature or the causal sequences of that which the historian describes?<sup>17</sup>

The incompatibility of the Christian tradition with any view, whether materialistic or idealistic, which conceives of the world as a closed system of law is not that Christianity stands or falls with some alternate metaphysic, but rather that a self-contained world is not consistent with the sovereignty of God.<sup>18</sup> If some part of reality is distinguished from the rest of creation as a closed system, then some question is raised as to the sovereignty of God within that system. The difficulty eighteenth-century Christians had with Providence or prayer illustrates the point.<sup>19</sup> In our own day the concept of nature as such a closed system is still so strong that only a vigorous imagination is able to conceive God's sovereignty as more meaningful than the role of having furnished some original blueprint. Roman Catholics have an advantage over Protestants at this point because they have been less affected by the scientific and idealistic rationalism of the past three hundred years. But recent Protestantism has found new meaning in the Christian doctrine of creation. Paul Tillich's discussion of God's sovereignty over a unified creation is directed specifically against recent assumptions of a self-sufficient universe and various modifications of this view which seek to reserve some area in which God can act.<sup>20</sup>

An indication of the change which has occurred in modern cul-

ture is the lack of embarrassment which contemporary theologians have in discussing prayer. As long as events were assumed to be determined within a fixed order, prayer could not be made intelligible except as a kind of psychological trick a person might play on himself. Even this would not have been plausible except that the fact of freedom and self-transcendence could never be consistently denied. But it is not uncommon now for Protestants to consider prayer as effective in something like the traditional sense. Clyde Manschreck several years ago published in the *Christian Century* an excellent article on the recovery of prayer by post-liberal Protestant theology, and Tillich has related prayer to the directing creativity of God in an especially clear and forceful statement.<sup>21</sup>

But efforts to reserve some area in which God can really be sovereign still indicate the hold which assumptions of a self-contained world have over us. I wonder if some such motivation is not involved in the attempt to find the meaning of history by relating each event in time to a timeless eternity. Reinhold Niebuhr's use of the terms "history" and "superhistory" suggests a comparison with the older distinction between natural and supernatural, though Niebuhr is, of course, far from denying the sovereignty of God in either sphere.<sup>22</sup> The relation of time to eternity in Christian thought is an extremely profound problem upon which I venture to comment only out of a genuine concern as a historian and not as one who claims to have studied the matter closely. If time is identified with creation, then I fail to see how a human life could be fulfilled outside it without losing its creatureliness. A fulfillment outside of creation would be, I suppose, some kind of absorption into the divine source of all being; and this, I am sure, is not intended by any Christian theologian. But if the distinction between time and eternity is a distinction that divides creation, then we become involved in some sort of metaphysical dualism in which the relationship between the two spheres is obscure.<sup>23</sup> Cullmann's denial that primitive Christianity was aware of any tension between time and eternity and his insistence that each epoch of time has its significance precisely as a part of the time process seems to me a more fruitful approach to the meaning of history and of our existence in it.<sup>24</sup>

The historical process itself as a cumulative development in time seems particularly hard to endow with meaning in terms of a supratemporal eternity. I have been impressed by the vigorous way in which Reinhold Niebuhr calls attention to this problem. In *Human Destiny* he not only affirms the meaningfulness of the historical process as such but points out the danger of ignoring that history must have a chronological end.<sup>25</sup> The problem is discussed more fully in the concluding chapter of *The Self and the Dramas of History*, where Niebuhr centers his interpretation in the Christian doctrine of resurrection. Yet

it seems to me that Niebuhr's discussion of the cumulative process and chronological end of history is not very well articulated to his understanding of the theological end of history in an eternity beyond time but ever impinging on the present moment.<sup>26</sup>

Considering our very fragmentary knowledge of history and of God's purposes in it, I certainly have no wish to minimize the difficulties of arriving at even the most tentative conclusions regarding the meaning of the historical process as a whole. Yet both the sinful strivings after community in history<sup>27</sup> and the biblical emphasis on the redemption of men into true community under God imply that the fulfillment of history must be in the perfection of community among men.<sup>28</sup> How long and tortuous the process may be and how many catastrophes may result from the growing opportunities for evil there is no way of knowing; but it is hard to conceive how the historical process can have meaning as such except in terms of its culmination.<sup>29</sup> If the teleological end of history is simply the fulfillment in eternity of the individual's fragmentary historical experience, then the unidirectional historical process in which we are now involved becomes a mere proving ground in which ethical problems can be posed for the individual—this would be otherworldliness of so extreme a character as to make unreal any problems which might be presented.

American theologians have certainly not been guilty of this kind of otherworldliness, but failure to deal adequately with the fulfillment of history in community has sometimes been misleading. This failure is, I think, a result of identifying history too exclusively with the *civitas terrena*. It is true that all human culture, even ecclesiastical institutions, is involved in the earthly city. But history has a dimension that transcends culture. The obedience of Jesus, Paul's decision of faith, the contrary decision of Felix, or of Celsus—all these events occurred in history and have their places in the time process; but they transcend all cultural and natural conditions. This is a very different thing from transcending the time process and is quite consistent with Cullmann's conception of "the line of redemptive history."<sup>30</sup> All human community, because it is an exercise of freedom and rests upon faith and commitment, likewise transcends culture. The distinction which Augustine makes between the two cities is a distinction between communities and not between cultures. The two cities are formed by two loves—the one "by the love of self even to the contempt of God" the other "by the love of God even to the contempt of self."<sup>31</sup> The heavenly city exists in history as a real though imperfect community, the members of which are involved in the earthly city. John Knox describes the creation of this community as an integral part of the Christ event.<sup>32</sup> It is not identical with the institutional church and ought not to be confused with any of its cultural effects; and yet it is not a mere



abstraction but a genuine fellowship.<sup>33</sup> It is a fellowship of sinners who accept the forgiveness of God and in whom God has begun his new creation.

Contemporary theologians are undoubtedly right in protesting against all efforts to accomplish the fulfillment of history by the refinement of culture; but this must not be understood as a denial of the power of God to perfect that new creation which he has begun in the community of Christian faith.<sup>34</sup> Any Christian interpretation of Western history and any Christian speculation as to the ultimate meaning of the historical process must I think, relate itself to the existence of this community of redemption.

The interaction of the community of Christian faith with the culture it has done so much to form in Western Europe has given rise to a dialectical movement of great complexity and obscurity. So far as I know no interpretation of Western history has dealt with this dialectical movement in a comprehensive way. Historians are, however, perennially concerned with various aspects of it. In what way and to what extent was the Middle Ages a Christian culture? What interpretation of the sixteenth century will do justice to both the secularism of the Renaissance and the religious fervor of the Reformation? To what extent was the Reformation a political or economic phenomenon? How does the faith of the Enlightenment relate to the inherited tradition of Western Europe? How does the religious dichotomy in nineteenth-century France relate to the political dichotomy? How can the defection of the Nazi and Communist movements from the Western tradition be defined and explained? All of these questions have been important issues among historians, and all of them relate to a basic tension between the culture of Western Europe and its religious foundations.

The existence of any human culture is dependent upon some common orientation toward experience. In the case of Western Europe this common orientation has never been the Christian faith but rather a complex of ideas and attitudes in which those derived from the Christian tradition have been dominant. No definitive list of these commonly accepted ideas and attitudes would be possible, but they have included belief in the goodness of the material world, in the danger of material pleasures, in the transcendent worth of the lowliest man, and in the unidirectional nature of history with the implication that history has meaning in terms of the culmination toward which it moves.

The culture which arose in medieval Europe was a serious distortion of Christian faith; but it was in some unmistakable sense Christian. Consider the conversion of the Saxons by Charlemagne. Charlemagne conquered them and gave them the simple choice of being live Christians or dead pagans. It is inconceivable that all or even most of the Saxons who were baptized as a result of Charlemagne's threats

became members of the community of saints. And yet in some real sense these people became Christian. What they accepted was the complex cultural phenomenon we call the Christian religion, and this was sufficient to bring them within the orbit of the embryonic Western civilization. Nothing could be clearer than that the cultural unity of Europe was due in the first instance to its Christianization.<sup>35</sup> But Christianity as one of the great world religions is a cultural phenomenon and is not synonymous with that community of sinners who live by faith in the forgiveness of God.<sup>36</sup>

The understanding of Western history involves understanding the relation of Christian faith to the expression and distortion of that faith in culture—including those aspects of culture which we call religious. In this difficult area of historical interpretation the insights of theologians are particularly helpful. Tillich's interpretation of the late Middle Ages as a heteronomous culture is an excellent example and deserves very serious attention from historians.<sup>37</sup> His concept of the theonomous as "a culture in which the ultimate meaning of existence shines through all finite forms of thought and action" helps us to understand how the poets of our own age by their sensitive participation in contemporary culture come to ask questions which point back to the faith upon which the culture rests.<sup>38</sup> Even the answer of Christian faith may be mediated through the secular culture; but as Tillich's concept of the "Gestalt of grace" emphasizes, it is God who takes the initiative in this as in all other revelations of Himself.<sup>39</sup>

But the relation of faith and culture remains ambiguous, and the ambiguity is not merely the inadequacy of the cultural expression of faith or its adulteration with cultural fragments of non-Christian origin. As Reinhold Niebuhr in particular has insisted, the cultural expressions of Christian faith become themselves objects of faith, and the new faiths enter creatively into the further elaboration of culture. But to trust ultimately in any expression of Christian faith is to worship the creature rather than the Creator and is thus a form of idolatry. Theologians have unweariedly pointed out the difference between faith in the forgiveness of God and faith in the proposition that God will forgive. The most persistent idolatry in Christendom is the worship of the church or of some theological formulation.

There is thus a basic dialectic in Western culture. The community of Christian faith remains culturally creative: but all expressions of the faith, and particularly the best expressions, tend to become centers of idolatrous faiths. The idolatry may not, of course, be explicit, and in the early history of the West was rarely so. When Christian and pseudo-Christian unite in their affirmation of Christian faith and in their acceptance of a complex of ideas and value judgments which de-

rive therefrom, it is not possible to come to grips with this dialectic directly on the basis of analyzing and describing historical phenomena. Nevertheless, an understanding of the dialectic can furnish fruitful insights into many historical problems. It might, for example, throw considerable light upon the place of religion in the political thought of Edmund Burke. Of still greater interest is the relevance of the dialectic between faith and culture to the fundamental dichotomy in the history of the modern world.

What the historian has commonly conceived as the progressive secularizing of modern Europe has been a far more positive and deliberate movement than the mere attenuation of religious influences in the process of cultural development. What we call secularization is associated with the rise of modern humanism as a movement of the human spirit in opposition to the Christian understanding of man and his predicament. Like any Christian idolatry, humanism centers in an affirmation of certain aspects of Western culture; but it introduces a new element by its explicit and self-conscious denial of the basic insights of Christian faith. Humanism thus achieved its emancipation from any effective criticism that might proceed from the perspective of Christian faith. The dialectic tended to become a simple dichotomy, and in our day this dichotomy threatens the unity of the total culture.

It was not until the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the Enlightenment that humanism emerged as a broad scale movement in self-conscious opposition to the traditional Christian faith. The humanist repudiated the understanding of himself as in any radical sense a sinner before God and insisted that man was endowed with moral and intellectual faculties sufficient to achieve his own salvation. That the rise of modern humanism involved commitment and faith—that it was, in short, a religious movement—has become increasingly apparent to historians.<sup>40</sup> The history of modern Europe is to a very considerable degree the history of the intricate relationship between Christianity and humanism—a relationship which involves the interaction of each with the total culture.

Wiley's *Seventeenth Century Background* is an excellent introduction to the problem. His treatment, especially his chapter on Milton, reveals that the tension between two faiths is not simply a conflict between devotees of each but is a tension within individuals throughout the culture. This is true still, although some choosing of sides and alignment of opposing groups and institutions has been going on since the seventeenth century. We are all to some degree humanists, and none of us has escaped the influence of Christianity.<sup>41</sup> The persistence of attempts to draw a line of demarcation between medieval and modern is due to a sense of the change which humanism has wrought in the religious complexion of the West; but the difficulty of finding any



period when medieval ends and modern begins is evidence, on the other hand, of the continuing strength of the Christian tradition and of the ethical and cultural affinity which early forms of humanism had with Christianity.<sup>42</sup> Recent interpretations of the Enlightenment have made reasonably clear that the moral ideals which the *philosophes* ascribed to reason were in fact inherited from the common Christian tradition of Europe. The brilliant essay of Carl Becker on this subject has been generally accepted.<sup>43</sup> The dissatisfaction which is sometimes expressed with Becker is due to the fact that his emphasis on what the *philosophes* retained obscures the freshness of the Enlightenment and the essentially different meaning which old ideas had when set in the new faith. There is room for both Becker and his critics. The Enlightenment was an anti-Christian humanistic movement that developed in and out of a Christian civilization.

Professor Crane Brinton's study of the Jacobins indicates that the political expression of Enlightenment humanism in the French Revolution was accompanied by an intensification of its religious fervor. The extension of this movement into nineteenth-century French politics has been described by Roger Soltau as an inverted Catholicism.<sup>44</sup> Soltau's analysis of political thought in nineteenth-century France reveals the religious dichotomy in France and is a straightforward recognition of the religious dimension in modern culture.

One of the most fateful humanistic developments in the last century was the transformation of the nation state into an object of religious faith which Carlton J. H. Hayes has described as the real alternate to Christianity in the modern world.<sup>45</sup>

It was not in nationalism, however, but in nineteenth-century Prometheism that humanism reached what is perhaps its clearest expression. In Nietzsche especially are the issues clearly drawn between Christian faith and the ideal of man independent and triumphant. Less profound but more popular was the Promethean defiance inherent in the scientific humanism represented by Comte, Spencer, H. G. Wells, and Julian Huxley. Wells's attempt to start a new Promethean religion in 1917 is one among several similar efforts to give adequate expression to the religious meaning of the movement.<sup>46</sup> In our own century Prometheism, nationalism, and utilitarian scientism have been institutionalized in the totalitarian state.

The varieties of humanism range from Bentham to Marx, from the rational utopianism of Robespierre to the Promethean scientism of Julian Huxley, from Voltaire to Hitler.<sup>47</sup> Yet the movement has an essential unity. The Marxist movement is hardly conceivable apart from the general revolutionary tradition that stemmed from 1789, and the affinities of Rousseau with modern totalitarianism have received considerable attention of late.<sup>48</sup> From Voltaire to G. B. Shaw or from

Edwin Chadwick to Sidney Webb one is conscious of moving within the same framework of ideas and ideals.<sup>49</sup> The continuity of the great humanist tradition is largely due to the consistency of its passionate repudiation of the Christian doctrine of sin and of man's dependence on God. But the Christian understanding of man is not simple, and in denying part of it humanists actually gave greater emphasis to other parts. Their concern to affirm the goodness of man against the Christian concept of sin has enhanced the emphasis in Western culture on the transcendent worth of the individual man. And their concern to be emancipated even from God has strengthened the expression in our culture of the Christian doctrine of human freedom. The common ground between Christianity and humanism has also, until recently, included a humanitarian ethic. Wilberforce and Bentham could agree in opposing slavery, if in little else. The continued unity of Western civilization despite the developing religious dichotomy within it has been due to the common ground between Christianity and humanism.<sup>50</sup>

Only in the present century, when the emancipation from Christianity has seemed too certain to be of much interest, have there appeared forms of humanism in which men become mere means to humanistic ends.<sup>51</sup> The result has been a radical moral and political crisis which threatens to destroy the unity of the Western tradition. Outside of totalitarian societies, of course, Western humanists have remained, on the whole, humanitarian and are as staunch as any Christian in their opposition to the anti-humanitarian humanisms of modern totalitarianism. Not many American humanists feel any affinities with Hitler.

But what Stanley Hopper calls "the concrete logic of events in history" has confronted modern humanism with a problem which it has been powerless to solve.<sup>52</sup> The inability of humanism to interpret the present crisis in Western culture is in sharp contrast to the prophetic clarity with which a revived Christian theology has shown the relevance to it of Christian concepts of sin, the demonic power of the human spirit, the sovereign judgment of God over history. Reinhold Niebuhr has been particularly effective in communicating these ideas to scholars in secular fields. An interesting example of his influence is found in R. H. S. Crossman's contribution to *New Fabian Essays*. Crossman, who is one of the most intelligent and learned of British socialists and by no means a defeatist, has expressed his appreciation of Christian realism about man in the following unequivocal manner:

*The evolutionary and the revolutionary philosophies of progress have both proved false. Judging by the facts, there is far more to be said for the Christian doctrine of original sin than for Rousseau's fantasy of the noble savage, or Marx's vision of the classless society.*<sup>53</sup>

Historical scholarship now for the first time since its phenomenal

development in the early nineteenth century finds itself in contact with a rigorous theological scholarship which shows a completely unanticipated ability to take the initiative in the interpretation of culture. We are all aware of the very notable contributions which Professor Richard Niebuhr has made in this area. His *Christ and Culture* is the best introduction to the whole vast field of discussion. Historians, already familiar with a certain givenness in human experience and with the unpredictable quality of human motivation, are in a position to profit by the insights of theologians. Mutual stimulation and creative interchange between the two fields is inevitable; for each is a challenge to the other, and neither can complete its task without the aid of the other. Many theologians have an inadequate knowledge of history. They tend to vacillate between a naive economic determinism on the one hand and an overemphasis on intellectual history on the other. Historians who are not seminary trained are at least equally weak in theology. Both are agreed, however, in their well-founded suspicions of any neat philosophy of history,<sup>54</sup> and the historian may find that he can avoid the pitfalls of such systems and yet achieve a deeper sense of the meaningfulness of the historical process through Christian faith in the sovereignty of God.

1. Basil Willey, *The Seventeenth Century Background* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934).
2. Arthur O. Lovejoy, "The Parallel of Deism and Classicism," *Essays in the History of Ideas* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1948), pp. 79-83.
3. Robert Gorham Davis, "In a Raveled World Love Endures," *New York Times Book Review*, December 26, 1954, p. 13.
4. Thomas Wolfe, *A Stone, A Leaf, A Door*, selected and arranged in verse by John S. Barnes (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945), p. 1.
5. Sir James Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1932); John W. N. Sullivan, *The Limitations of Science* (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, 1933).
6. Cf. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Self and the Dramas of History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), pp. 109-111; and Paul J. Tillich, "The World Situation," *The Christian Answer*, Henry P. Van Dusen, ed., (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), pp. 40-41.
7. Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (2nd ed., London, 1881), II, 414-415.
8. Mark Pattison, "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750," *Essays and Reviews* (London, 1860), pp. 259-264.
9. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*

(New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), pp. 110, 113-115, and 143. See also Reinhold Niebuhr, *Self and the Dramas of History*, pp. 155-156; and *Faith and History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 32.

10. On the religious sterility of liberalism compare Niebuhr, *Self and the Dramas of History*, p. 147. Students of English history as diverse in perspective as Lecky, Halévy, Somervell, and Ensor have recognized the widespread effects of Evangelicalism on nineteenth-century English society. I do not think the social effects of any liberal Christian movement have loomed so large in modern history. I am assuming, of course, that French democracy in men like Michelet and Quinet was humanistic rather than Christian in origin. It is a curious thing that Christian faith has had most effect on the general culture when it has not been primarily concerned with social idealism. A proper investigation of this matter would involve the whole question of social dynamics, a field which has not as yet been sufficiently explored by theologians or historians. Tillich's concept of the relation of Protestantism to secularism is relevant here (Paul Tillich, *The Protestant Era*, tr. by James Luther Adams [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948], p. 220). After all, the individual is most Christian when as a forgiven

- sinner he turns his attention outward to concrete problems and not when he is self-consciously striving to be Christian. Perhaps the approach of the church to the general society should also be that of interest in concrete problems rather than criticism from the perspective of some allegedly Christian ideal such as democratic egalitarianism elevated to a moral absolute.
11. Cf. Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 25.
  12. Cf. Bernard Eugene Meland, *The Reawakening of Christian Faith* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949), pp. 73-74.
  13. Niebuhr, *Self and the Dramas of History*, pp. 41-42 and 61-72.
  14. *Ibid.*, pp. 51-52, 91, 111, and 230; *Faith and History*, p. 98; *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), II, 166 and 205-206.
  15. *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. by Hans Werner Bartsch, tr. by Reginald H. Fuller (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), pp. 3-5 and 197.
  16. *Ibid.*, pp. 34, 197, and 199. Cf. Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), Chapter V.
  17. *Kerygma and Myth*, pp. 34, 38, and 39.
  18. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), I, 261-263.
  19. Caleb Fleming, an English Unitarian of the early eighteenth century who was concerned to defend Providence from the deists, admitted that God never violated the natural laws he had established; he argued, however, that some things were not governed by any of these laws but were subject to the immediate will of God. One example of such free areas was the wind, which, as the scriptures say, "bloweth where it listeth," that is, where God pleases. Caleb Fleming, *Remarks on Mr. Thomas Chubb's Vindication of His True Gospel* (London, 1739), p. 62.
  20. Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, I, 261-263.
  21. Clyde Manschreck, "Why We Do Not Pray," *Christian Century*, LXX (September 23, 1953), 1077-1078. Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, I, 267.
  22. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, II, 50. Cf. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*, pp. 185 and 195.
  23. As Daniel Day Williams points out, the dualism between time and eternity is Greek rather than Hebraic in origin. *Op. cit.*, p. 40.
  24. Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, tr. by Floyd V. Filson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950), pp. 49, 51, 62, 68, and 144-145. Cf. Niebuhr, *Nature and Destiny of Man*, II, 287.
  25. Niebuhr, *Nature and Destiny of Man*, II, 301 and 309. Cf. Bultmann in *Kerygma and Myth*, p. 5.
  26. Niebuhr is so thoroughly aware of this problem (*Nature and Destiny of Man*, II, p. 309, footnote 12) that I am tempted to doubt my own criticism of him and wonder if I have properly understood his position.
  27. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*, pp. 32-33 and 157.
  28. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Bible To-day* (Cambridge University Press, 1952), pp. 142-143.
  29. Niebuhr, *Nature and Destiny of Man*, II, 301 and 315-321.
  30. Cullmann, *op. cit.* Cf. James Muilenburg, "The History of the Religion of Israel," *Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952), I, 294.
  31. Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, tr. by Marcus Dods, Modern Library ed. (New York: Random House, 1950), p. 477.
  32. John Knox, *On the Meaning of Christ* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947), pp. 97-106.
  33. H. Emil Brunner, *The Misunderstanding of the Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953).
  34. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*, pp. 194-196, 228, and 235-236.
  35. Christopher Dawson, *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1950).
  36. Cf. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*, p. 11.
  37. Tillich, *The Protestant Era*, pp. xvi, 57, and 141.
  38. *Ibid.*, pp. xvi, and 58-61.
  39. *Ibid.*, pp. 210-211, 213, and 220.
  40. Historians are not always aware of the degree to which they are committed to the same faith. An interesting example is Carl Becker's recapitulation in his own experience of that persistent devotion to an undermined faith which he had rather condescendingly described in the eighteenth-century *philosophes*. Becker's experience is described by Leo Gershoy in "Carl Becker on Progress and Power," *American Historical Review*, LV (1949), 22-35.
  41. Crane Brinton, *Ideas and Men* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 135; Meland, *Reawakening of Christian Faith*, pp. 2, 65-66, and 73-75.
  42. Wallace K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948), pp. 286-289, 295, 344-345, 355-356, 381, and 396; Brinton, *Ideas and Men*, pp. 377 and 406-407.
  43. Carl L. Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932).
  44. Clarence Crane Brinton, *The Jacobins* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1930); Roger Henry Soltau, *French*

*Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (London: E. Benn, 1931).

45. Carlton J. H. Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1928), pp. 93-125.
46. H. G. Wells, *God the Invisible King* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1917).
47. Cf. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*, p. 36.
48. One of the most interesting of such interpretations of Rousseau is by a sociologist: Robert A. Nisbet, *The Quest for Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953).
49. Professor Cushing Strout has recently published an article on certain varieties of American humanism under the interesting title "The Twentieth-Century Enlightenment," *The American Political Science Review*, XLIX (June, 1955), pp. 321-339.
50. Cf. Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking*, p. 22; Brinton, *Ideas and Men*, pp. 399-408.
51. The debate about man as sinner presupposed the common acceptance of his transcendent worth. Even when it has been most radically opposed, Christianity has furnished a kind of structure in the total culture. Cf. Meland, *op cit.*, pp. 65-66 and 74-75.
52. Stanley Romaine Hopper, *The Crisis of Faith* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944), pp. 46-48.
53. R. H. S. Crossman, "Towards a Philosophy of Socialism," *New Fabian Essays* (London: Turnstile Press, 1953), p. 8.
54. Niebuhr, *The Self and the Dramas of History*, pp. 45-50.

## ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM IN THE PURITAN REVOLUTION

LEO F. SOLT, *Indiana University*.

The preachers of the New Model Army during the 1640's and 1650's engaged in a three-pronged attack upon the educated people of Puritan England, i.e., upon the clergy, the university teachers, and the lawyers. Both the Levellers and the Diggers gave strong support to this anti-professional or anti-intellectual point of view. Most of the Army preachers, especially William Dell, John Saltmarsh, Thomas Collier, Walter Cradock, and William Erbery, were purveyors of that branch of Independent Puritanism (sometimes called Antinomianism) which stressed the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit rather than formal learning. Furthermore, despite the conclusions of R. H. Tawney about Puritanism in general,<sup>1</sup> the Army preachers were generally concerned with the poor and uneducated members of society rather than the prosperous and educated. In the phraseology of H. Richard Niebuhr, they sought "the salvation of the socially disinherited."<sup>2</sup> An examination of this interest in social amelioration will help to clarify the anti-intellectual attack.

The central belief in Antinomian theology was the doctrine of "free justification by free grace alone." The doctrine of free grace stated that the Spirit of God had saved His chosen ones from unredeemed mankind without any act of faith on the part of the Saints. Faith was an effect, not a cause of God's saving grace. In this theology there were no contractual conditions to be fulfilled, no good works to be performed, and no free will to be exercised. Grace alone gave assurance of salvation, resulting, through the removal of original sin, in the perfectibility (though not the perfection) of man. The abrogation of the law of Moses brought Christian liberty for the Saints of God alone.<sup>3</sup> However, two of the New Model chaplains, Richard Baxter and, to a lesser extent, Hugh Peters, were adherents of the Federal or Covenant theology. Although Peters was not unsympathetic to his colleagues' Antinomian views, Baxter was greatly opposed to them.

Tawney singled out Baxter as an eminent divine whose writings cemented an alliance between God and Mammon. Nevertheless, in his *Christian Directory*, undertaken some years after he left his chaplaincy in the New Model Army, Baxter wrote that riches were in themselves but dross which leave the wealthy as poor as any man at the grave. The more of your Master's talents you have, the more you will finally have to account for. "And very few rich men escape the snare and come to heaven."<sup>4</sup> Chaplain Dell also excluded land and money, as



well as learning and titles of nobility, as prerequisites for salvation. In his mind it was every bit as easy for a poor mechanic to become persuaded of Christ's love through the Holy Spirit as it was for a tradesman, or indeed for a nobleman or for a king.<sup>5</sup> And Walter Cradock, whose sermons on Antinomianism were very popular in the Army, according to Baxter, wrote: "I am afraid some of you make *too much hast to be rich* . . . oh that you would be exhorted to heare the cause of the poor."<sup>6</sup>

David W. Petegorsky, in his Marxian analysis, *Left-Wing Democracy in the English Civil War*, was not at a loss to account for the relation between the spiritualism of most of the chaplains, (what he termed the chiliastic mysticism of the sectaries), and their concern for the poor and oppressed members of society. The sectaries, he believed, as the precursors of the true proletarians of the seventeenth century, the Diggers, found it necessary to compensate for their depressed material conditions through a mystical union with God. Because orthodox Calvinism equated the poor with the non-Elect or the damned, the sectaries, according to Petegorsky, adapted Puritan theology to meet their needs. By substituting an inner spiritual experience for formal education, these sectaries proclaimed the spiritual quality of all mankind. In short, said Petegorsky, salvation was not the monopoly of the educated; it was possible for every man. Once again Calvinism had accommodated itself to the economic conditions of a particular class.<sup>7</sup> The Antinomian chaplains did substitute an inner spiritual experience for formal education as Petegorsky has suggested. They did not, however, proclaim the spiritual equality of all mankind but only the spiritual equality of the Saints, despite the attacks of their critics that they had interpreted Calvinist theology to mean universal redemption.<sup>8</sup>

There is no doubt, however, that the chaplains were quite sympathetic to the problems of the poor. As early as April, 1645, chaplain Peters told both Houses of Parliament that the streets were swarming with the poor and queried why the "Senators of this Citie . . . should . . . be so beggarly in the matter of beggars?"<sup>9</sup> In a similar vein in a sermon before the House of Commons on November 25, 1646, chaplain Dell entreated the members to regard "the oppression of the poor, and the sighing of the needy." There never was more injustice and oppression in the nation, continued Dell, than at the present time. Whereupon he warned them if they would not do God's work in the Kingdom, which they had been called to do, then God would do it Himself without them.<sup>10</sup> There is some reason for believing that the warnings of Cradock, Peters, and Dell about the depressed state of the poor corresponded to the actual state of affairs. During the 1640's some poor harvests due to bad weather caused food prices to be-

come dearer than ever before, and wages were not keeping up with this rise.<sup>11</sup> Also, various sources indicate that there were numerous reports about the very depressed condition of trade during the Civil War period.<sup>12</sup> "Let us still remember," wrote Peters in his *Last Report*, "the support of Trade is the strength of this Island, discountenance the merchant, and take beggery by the hand."<sup>13</sup>

Having said this, it must be stated that the Antinomian preachers' interest in the poor was, generally speaking, peripheral to their other interests. They were not communists in buff-coats of "theological camouflage." In their theology of perfectibility there was no continuous struggle between the forces of good and evil at the barricade of conscience whereupon the forces, and yes, forcers, of good would usher in a new *classless* millennium. Instead, they fixed their gaze on new revelations of truth which would result in the reign of the Saints—the new Jerusalem. Their modification of Calvinism toward the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, it seems, was not designed to hasten the overthrow of capitalistic Puritanism nor to compensate, as Petegorsky suggests, for poor environmental conditions. They were primarily trying to guarantee an affirmative answer to the age-old theological question, "Am I saved?" Their reply was, of course, a resounding yes!

Now it is true that Dell and Saltmarsh did share some views, especially the mystical religion of the Spirit, with the famous Digger, Gerrard Winstanley. All three men had little use for outward religious forms; all three believed that men could be saved by the power of God alone; both Saltmarsh and Winstanley thought of the millennium in terms of progressive revelations.<sup>14</sup> Winstanley believed that the revelations of Reason or Spirit had given every man a "creation-right" to the "common treasury" of the earth. With the sin of covetousness all men had fallen, yet all men were capable of redemption. A "sign" of the great change that was about to occur through a new revelation, was the experiment of digging led by Winstanley at St. George's Hill, near Cobham, in Surrey.<sup>15</sup> Neither Dell nor Saltmarsh followed Winstanley's belief in universal redemption, and none of the army preachers was attracted to Winstanley's economic views.<sup>16</sup> Dell did believe that a "poor mean Christian that earns his bread by hard labour is a thousand times more precious and excellent" than a sinful and unregenerate gentleman, knight, nobleman, or king.<sup>17</sup> That is no proof that one can equate the theology of the Spirit with any particular social or economic class, although it does suggest Dell's own leanings. The disproof of such an equation lies in the devotion to the religion of the Spirit of men like Oliver Cromwell, Henry Vane the younger, and Francis Rous, none of them from the dispossessed. At the Putney Debates the concern of Cromwell was not the interest of the poor but the interest of men of property and privilege. "All the main



thing that I speak for," said Cromwell's political theorist, Ireton, "is because I would have an eye to property."<sup>18</sup> The Spirit of the Lord recognized no economic barriers.

The interest of the chaplains in the dispossessed is closely related to their attack upon the clergy, the university professors, and the lawyers. David Ogg has stated that the Puritans (meaning Independents) were socially little better than pariah and that their main motive (except for the lawyers) in establishing the New Jerusalem was anti-professionalism.<sup>19</sup> Testimony of this anti-professional or anti-intellectual attitude can be found in a tract by Robert Baillie, the prolific diarist and letter-writer, in which this eminent Presbyterian attacked a sermon of Dell's before the House of Commons on the subject of the reformation of the church. Baillie was convinced from long experience that the spirit which guided sectaries such as Dell into church reformation would press them on to pull down the state as well. "*Wee need not speak of their declared rage against Universities and all Societies of Learning, against the Society of Merchant-adventurers, against the Common-Councell and Court of Aldermen in the City of London: all these things to them are corruptions, and grievances to be extirpate.*"<sup>20</sup> Petegorsky has suggested that the substitution of the Scriptures, which could be read by the literate and educated, for the formal education of the church prelates as the final authority in religious life left the illiterate and uneducated poor with only the power of the Holy Spirit as the true authority in religious knowledge.<sup>21</sup> This thesis may have some validity in the New Model Army. Sir Charles Firth has estimated that a majority of the soldiers in the infantry regiments of the New Model could not even write their names, but the members of the cavalry regiments, who took the lead in the political movements in 1647 and after, had many men of some education among them.<sup>22</sup> Some evidence of the antipathy between Antinomianism and academic learning in the Army can be noted in the presence of the numerous "mechanick" or lay preachers, such as Paul Hobson the cobbler, who, as artisans, preached the Antinomian gospel of Free Grace.<sup>23</sup> One of the best examples of Petegorsky's view of spiritual religion and education can be found in the writings of William Dell.

The university now, as in the days of Wycliffe, Hus, and Luther, wrote Dell, has the same heathenish and anti-Christian doctrine ruled over by Aristotle. The study of Aristotle (who is dead and damned yet remains exalted by the authority of Thomas Aquinas) emphasized free will and natural philosophy rather than Christ.<sup>24</sup> John Webster, who was possibly a chaplain in the New Model Army, also attacked Aristotle's influence in the universities. In his tract *Academiarum Examen* Webster wrote that academies had undertaken to teach prospective ministers an understanding of the mysteries of the kingdom of

heaven whereas such knowledge could only be achieved through the Holy Spirit.<sup>25</sup> "To this I know it will be objected," wrote Webster, "That *Schools* teach the knowledge of tongues, without which the Scriptures (being originally written in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*) cannot be truly and rightly translated, expounded, nor interpreted: and therefore it is necessary that *Schools* and *Academies* should teach these, as properly and mainly conducive to this end." However, Webster felt that languages had been changed and altered as "fashions and garments." Besides, he added, whoever relies upon a translator is the same as one who relies upon a teacher.<sup>26</sup>

Liberal education, wrote Dell, with its study of language and the sciences, with its degrees and ordinations, does not change one iota the corrupt and inward evil nature in which the practitioners of its life of knowledge and learning were born.<sup>27</sup> It was not only Webster and Dell who suggested that learning alone, without the power of the Holy Spirit, was insufficient preparation for the ministry.<sup>28</sup> Saltmarsh, too, while admonishing men not to despise one another for learning, conceded that he allowed learning its place anywhere in the kingdom of the world, but not in the kingdom of God.<sup>29</sup> Even John Lilburne believed that the truth of the gospel of Christ was "too homely a thing" for the great and learned doctors of the world to embrace.<sup>30</sup> Winstanley called the universities "standing ponds of stinking waters."<sup>31</sup> An indication of the extent to which the followers of chaplain Erbery were prepared to go in their hostility to formal learning occurred during a debate between Erbery and Francis Chyennell at Oxford in 1646. The site of the dispute had to be changed from the "publick Schools" to a church (albeit the University church) because some of Erbery's supporters were unwilling to meet in the schools.<sup>32</sup>

If all divinity is swaddled in human learning, or if learning is an art to deceive and abuse the understanding of men, as the Leveller Walwyn believed,<sup>33</sup> then how shall poor plain people, who have not the leisure (or, it might be added, money) to attain a formal education, be saved? "Ignorance," answered Dell, "*is more fit and ready to receive the Gospel, than Wisdom.*"<sup>34</sup> Nevertheless, Dell's attack upon learning as a prerequisite for the ministry did not mean that he, or indeed Webster, was against secular learning.<sup>35</sup> They simply made a sharp separation between religious and secular knowledge, just as Dell and Saltmarsh had done between the spheres of grace and nature in the toleration controversy.<sup>36</sup> For instance, Dell advocated a college or university for every large English city; e.g. London, York, Bristol, Exeter, and Norwich. In these colleges and universities, which should receive a "competent maintenance" from the state, the liberal arts and sciences

would be taught to twenty persons instead of one in order to make men serviceable to the commonwealth. These colleges were not to be erected for the purpose of achieving salvation or training men for the ministry. Furthermore, they would be taught by "Godly and Learned Men."<sup>37</sup> There is no doubt but that Dell included himself within this group of "Godly and Learned Men" after he became the Master of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, in 1649. On his qualifications for the post Richard Baxter observed that "*Reason, Sound Doctrine, Order, and Concord*" were the greatest strangers to Dell's mind.<sup>38</sup> The utilitarian role in education can also be found in Webster's thought. The subject which had the greatest practical value for him was natural philosophy or natural science; his mentor was Francis Bacon.<sup>39</sup> Another one of the chaplains who showed great sympathy for the ideas of Bacon was Hugh Peters.<sup>40</sup> Peters, too, was for the extension of learning, but the academies he proposed were to teach piety and righteousness, in contradistinction to Dell, and were to be for the nobility and the gentry.<sup>41</sup>

The Antinomian attack upon the universities ran strictly counter to the traditional Puritan emphasis upon a "Godly and Learned" ministry. It has been suggested that during the period, 1640-1660, the Puritans in the main were not arrayed against an educated ministry nor did they fail to appreciate the importance of the universities.<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless, the New Model chaplains, the Levellers, and the Diggers did attack them. What is more ironical, most of the chaplains who condemned university education were themselves educated in universities. Peters even helped to found Harvard College.<sup>43</sup>

A second major aspect of the anti-intellectualism upon which the Army preachers, especially Peters, and the Levellers and the Diggers found themselves in agreement, was the subject of reform and administration of the law. In 1646 an anonymous pamphleteer observed in the tract *Every Mans Right* that after five years of contest between the King and Parliament, the commonalty were still enslaved by the arbitrary will and power of a few mercenary lawyers. These lawyers charged the iniquitous fee of ten or twenty shillings irrespective of whether or not their services were worth it. "It is therefore to be considered," continued the author, "whether it be agreeable to justice, and the freedom and prosperity of this Nation, that the prosperity and flourishing state of a few Lawyers, Attorneys, Jaylours, and their adherents should be preserved before the just liberty, peace, and well being of this whole Nation and their posterities."<sup>44</sup> Collier complained in October, 1647, "that to seek a Remedy" in the courts of law "proves worse than the disease; many an honest man chusing rather to suffer losse."<sup>45</sup> Ogg has suggested that the lawyer's profits came largely from conveyancing—the practice of examining titles to property, giving opin-

ions about their validity, and the drawing of deeds in the exchange of property from one person to another. The remedy seemed to be a Land Registry which would obviate inquiries into the title of property.<sup>46</sup> The cure of the Buckinghamshire Levellers and Peters for this situation was set forth in the latter's pamphlet in October, 1646, entitled *A Word for the Army*. Peters wanted to keep local records in all counties of all men's estates and alienations, which should in turn be transmitted to "a grand or leiger Record at Westminster." This would avoid the delay and expense of taking cases to the quarterly courts at Westminster.<sup>47</sup>

It was not only the lawyers but the law itself which drew fire from the critics.<sup>48</sup> The severity of the criminal code then, as in Bentham's day, was a cause of serious complaint. It was Peters' view, as well as that of the Leveller Overton,<sup>49</sup> that prisoners for debt should be "dispatched" and not lose their heads or their hands. Poor thieves should not be hanged but usefully employed or banished. A second grievance, implicit in the anti-Normanism of the Levellers, was the language of the law—a continuous reminder of its Norman origin.<sup>50</sup> It is a real oppression, wrote Collier, that the French should be better read in English laws than Englishmen are.<sup>51</sup> Thirdly, much agitation arose over the evils of the Court of Chancery for the delays in justice which came about as a result of labyrinthine procedure. One Leveller's advice was to make the laws "certain, short, and plain,"<sup>52</sup> and Peters wrote: "Quicke Justice makes quiet Commonwealths, for this keeps Hollanders happy under heavy taxes."<sup>53</sup>

Peters' attitude toward legal reform in 1646 underwent something of a change in the next few years. Robert Massey reported that Peters, while visiting Lilburne in the Tower of London on 25 May 1649, told "Free-born John" that they had fought against the King in order to be free from the laws which were tyrannous, and not for the continuation or preservation of them.<sup>54</sup> Two years later Peters went so far as to advocate the burning of all the old records in the Tower as monuments of tyranny and sin.<sup>55</sup> (Unfortunately, his suggestions on legal reform have been remembered largely for this malapert advice.) One of the sparks from Peters' pen on the subject of law reform in 1657 ignited the imagination of Winstanley. The immediate provocation for Winstanley's utopian work, *The Law of Freedom*, as its author freely acknowledged, was the suggestion of Peters that law and government should be adapted to the Holy Scriptures.<sup>56</sup> On January 20, 1651, a Commonwealth law reform committee, including Sir Matthew Hale, Anthony Ashley Cooper, and Hugh Peters, among others, was appointed. Bulstrode Whitelocke, who often advised this committee, recorded in his *Memorials* that Peters was very active on the committee, highly opinionated, and understood very little of the

law. He would frequently mention some Dutch legal proceedings about which he was completely mistaken.<sup>57</sup>

The third major manifestation of anti-intellectualism by the chaplains, the Levellers, and the Diggers was directed against the tithing clergy. Winstanley, for example, believed that the payment of tithes was "the greatest sin of oppression."<sup>58</sup> The significance of the opposition to the tithe, and the opposition often included in 1647 some of the ejected ministry, lay in the opposition to church organization, for the tithe was the tenth part of the annual produce paid as a tax for the support of the clergy and religious institutions. Those who supported tithes, and they often included ministers put into confiscated livings, feared that tenants who asked to be relieved of paying tithes would soon ask to be relieved of paying rent. In the summer of 1647 Parliament, in response to the complaints from several counties by ministers unable to collect tithes, passed an act giving Justices of the Peace power to enforce tithes for ministers put into sequestered livings. After the passage of this act petitions, bearing clear traces of Leveller influence, marked the anti-tithe agitation. Indeed, both the second and third Agreements of the People as well as the Heads of Proposals proposed the abolition of tithes.<sup>59</sup> One Army preacher who was aware of these "petitions for deliverance" was Thomas Collier. Collier argued that the collection of tithes for the "belly-gods" was against both the Law and the Gospel, against conscience, and furthermore, "the people groan under it as an oppression."<sup>60</sup> Saltmarsh indicated his opposition by relinquishing his claim against the state for a year's arrearage of tithes.<sup>61</sup> Erbery wrote a book entitled *The Grand Oppressor, or, the Terror of Tithes*.<sup>62</sup> Peters and Dell, according to the newssheet *Mercurius Elencticus*, were against tithes, yet the latter chaplain took £200 per annum from his living at Yelden.<sup>63</sup>

In their attacks upon the clergy, the lawyers, and university teachers, the Levellers, the Diggers, and the Antinomian chaplains shared a common anti-intellectual attitude. Furthermore, they also possessed a common concern for the poor. However, the Army preachers did not share the ideas of political equality of the Levellers because they believed in the privileges of the Saints, i.e. government by good men rather than good laws. They did not share the economic ideas of the Diggers because they did not believe all men would inherit equally the kingdom of heaven manifest in the hearts of the Saints. The main concern of the Army preachers was not the political and economic reconstruction of society but the continuous search for further assurances of salvation. Their anti-intellectualism stemmed primarily from their theology, which stressed the direct manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the human conscience rather than a reliance upon professional groups. "For God doth not consider men as the World doth, to



wit, as they are *Tradesmen*, or *Gentlemen*, or *Scholars*, or *Clergymen*," wrote Dell, "but he considers men as Believers, or Unbelievers."<sup>64</sup>

Anti-intellectualism in our own day oftentimes suggests a fear or distrust of well-educated people because of their alleged sympathy with liberal ideas. In the Puritan Revolution anti-intellectualism expressed the hostility directed toward the traditional ideas of well-educated people by groups themselves frequently interested in social reform.

1. Tawney declared that "the chosen seat of the Puritan spirit seemed to be those classes in society which combined economic independence, education and a certain decent pride in their status." *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (Mentor Books edition; New York, 1947), pp. 168, 199-200.
2. H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (Hamden, Connecticut, 1954), p. 30.
3. Leo F. Solt, "John Saltmarsh: New Model Army Chaplain," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, II (April, 1951), pp. 69-80.
4. *The Practical Works of Richard Baxter* (London, 1847), I, 211, quoted in Winthrop S. Hudson, "Puritanism and the Spirit of Capitalism," *Church History*, XVIII (March, 1949), p. 13.
5. "Men that have Estates in Money or Land, depend on these things for their maintenance, but a Christian may have little or nothing of these in the world, but he hath a promise, which is a thousand times better, and makes his life more comfortable." William Dell, *The Building, Beauty, Teaching, and Establishment of the Truly Christian Church* (London, 1651), pp. 87, 91, contained in *Several Sermons and Discourses of William Dell*, reprinted in 1709. *Building, Beauty* was first published in 1646 under the title *The Building and Glory of the Christian Church*. Dell, *Christ's Spirit a Christian's Strength* (London, 1651), p. 22, contained in *Several Sermons and Discourses of William Dell*, reprinted in 1709. *Christ's Spirit* was first published in 1645 under the title of *Power from on High; or, the Power of the Holy Ghost*.
6. Walter Cradock, *The Saints Fulnesse of Joy in Their Fellowship with God* (London, 1646), p. 32.
7. David W. Petegorsky, *Left-Wing Democracy in the English Civil War* (London, 1940), pp. 64-65; Niebuhr called denominationalism the "accommodation of religion to the caste system." *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, p. 25.
8. Charles H. George, "A Social Interpretation of English Puritanism," *Journal of Modern History*, XXV (December, 1953), p. 341. George concluded that the "frightening independency" of the Army was a religion of the poor (which in many respects is true) and a religion of the damned (which is quite incorrect).
9. Hugh Peters, *God's Doings, and Man's Duty* (Second edition; London, 1645), p. 41.
10. William Dell, *Right Reformation, or the Reformation of the Church of the New Testament* (London, 1651), p. 158, contained in *Several Sermons and Discourses of William Dell*, reprinted in 1709; Dell, *Building, Beauty*, p. 87. Dell's warning seemed to carry an implied threat, for what better way was there for God to act, in relieving the suffering of the poor, than through His Saints, who, as co-inheritors of the Holy Spirit, acted with the power of God?
11. G. N. Clark, *The Wealth of England from 1496 to 1760* (London, 1946), p. 117.
12. Frederick C. Dietz, *An Economic History of England* (New York, 1942), pp. 184-85.
13. Hugh Peters, *Mr. Peter's Last Report of the English Wars* (London, 1646), p. 9. However, Peters felt merchants should be encouraged with a Law of Merchants.
14. Wilhelm Schenk, *The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution* (London, 1948), p. 98.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 100-102; George H. Sabine, ed., *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley* (Ithaca, New York, 1941), pp. 423, 82.
16. Sabine, *Winstanley*, p. 509.
17. Dell, *Building, Beauty*, p. 91.
18. A. S. P. Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty. Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents* (Second edition; Chicago, 1951), p. 57.
19. David Ogg, "English Puritanism and Its Importance in Schemes of Legal and Social Reform," a lecture delivered on 10 July 1951 at the Oxford Arts Festival, Oxford, England.
20. Robert Baillie, *Anabaptism, the True Fountaine* (London, 1647), Preface. John Bastwick wrote that many of the

- "Independent itinerary preachers run from place to place, preaching against the Nobility and Gentry, against the Reverend Assembly, against the Directory, against Tythes, against the Presbytery; yea against all that is called authority." Bastwick, *The Utter Routing of the Whole Army of All the Independents and Sectaries* (London, 1646), "The Epistle to the Reader."
21. Petegorsky, *Left-Wing Democracy*, p. 65.
22. Charles H. Firth, *Cromwell's Army* (London, 1902), p. 40.
23. D. B. Robertson has discussed at some length not only the anti-intellectual views of John Lilburne but also those of John Spencer and Samuel How, both "mechanick" preachers. *The Religious Foundations of Leveller Democracy* (New York, 1951), pp. 33-37. The following title of a pamphlet by How is suggestive: *The Sufficiencie of the Spirits Teaching Without Human Learning: or, a Treatise Tending to Prove Humane Learning to be no Help to the Spiritual Understanding of the Word of God.*
24. William Dell, *The Tryal of Spirits, both in Teachers and Hearers* (London, 1666), pp. 554, 635, contained in *Several Sermons and Discourses of William Dell*, reprinted in 1709. Furthermore, wrote Dell, the universities have kept the same "forms and follies," such as hoods, caps, scarlet robes, doctoral ring and dinner, kissing gloves, and music. In Tudor times as well as during the ascendancy of Archbishop Laud, some of these forms had been objects of abuse by the Puritans.
25. John Webster, *Academiæ Examen, or the Examination of Academies* (London, 1654), pp. 4, 9-11. Webster, deploring Aristotle's influence, especially political, in the universities, wrote: "yea even our own Countreyman master Hobbs hath pieces of more exquisiteness, and profundity in that subject, than ever the Graecian wit was able to reach unto or attain." *Academiæ Examen*, p. 88. However, Webster was attacked by Seth Ward for being a well-known Leveller. *Vindiciæ Academiæ* (Oxford, 1654), pp. 42-43. Indeed, Webster claimed, in the terminology of John Lilburne, to be a "free-born Englishman." "I must needs so far own Levelling," he wrote, "that I hold plain dealing to be a jewel." *Academiæ Examen*, "Epistle to the Reader."
26. Webster, *Academiæ Examen*, pp. 6-7.
27. Dell, *The Tryal of Spirits*, p. 529.
28. Dell, *Christ's Spirit*, p. 22.
29. John Saltmarsh, *An End of One Controversie*, contained in *Some Drops of the Viall* (London, 1646), p. 115; Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty*, p. 182.
30. Robertson, *The Religious Foundations of Leveller Democracy*, p. 39.
31. Sabine, *Winstanley*, p. 238.
32. [Francis Cheynell], *An Account Given to the Parliament by the Ministers Sent by Them to Oxford* (London, 1647), p. 38.
33. William Walwyn, *The Power of Love* (London, 1643), p. 44.
34. Dell, *The Tryal of Spirits*, pp. 585, 589.
35. Richard Schlatter, "The Higher Learning in Puritan England," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, XXIII (June, 1954), p. 172; Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1939), p. 78.
36. Leo F. Solt, "William Dell: New Model Army Chaplain," *The Church Quarterly Review*, CLV (January-March, 1954), p. 49.
37. Dell, *The Tryal of Spirits*, pp. 645-48. This secularization of university studies can also be found in Winstanley's *The Law of Freedom*. See Sabine, *Winstanley*, p. 67.
38. Richard Baxter, *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ* (London, 1696), p. 64.
39. Louis B. Wright, *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1935), pp. 73-75.
40. Peters thought that Bacon's *The Advancement of Learning* had propounded many excellent and "learned Problemes, experiments, and speculations." *Good Work for a Good Magistrate* (London, 1651), pp. 74-75.
41. Hugh Peters, *A Word for the Armie. And Two Words to the Kingdome* (London, 1647), p. 11.
42. W. A. L. Vincent, *The State and School Education 1640-1660 in England and Wales* (London, 1950), p. 88.
43. Raymond P. Stearns, *The Strenuous Puritan, Hugh Peters, 1598-1660* (Urbana, Illinois, 1954), p. 140.
44. *Every Mans Right: or Englands Perspective-Glasse* (n.p., 1646), pp. 5-6.
45. Thomas Collier, *A Discovery of the New Creation. In a Sermon Preached at the Head-Quarters at Putney Sept. 29, 1647* (London, 1647), p. 35.
46. Ogg, Oxford Arts Festival lecture, 10 July 1951.
47. Schenk, *The Concern for Social Justice*, p. 67; Peters, *A Word for the Armie*, p. 13.
48. Goldwin Smith, "The Reform of the Laws of England, 1640-1660," *The University of Toronto Quarterly*, X (July, 1941), pp. 476-77.
49. Richard Overton, *An Appeale* (London, 1647), reprinted in Don M. Wolfe, ed., *Leveller Manifestoes of the Puritan Revolution* (New York, 1944), p. 193.
50. "That all Lawes of the Land (loekt up from common capacities in the Latine or French tongues,) may bee

translated into the English tongue." *Ibid.*, p. 192.

51. Collier, *A Discovery of the New Creation*, p. 35.
52. *Mercurius Populi*, [November 11, 1647], p. 5, quoted in Schenk, *The Concern for Social Justice*, p. 67.
53. Peters, *A Word for the Armie*, pp. 12-13.
54. Robert Massey, *The Examination and Correction of a Paper Lately Printed Intituled a Relation of the Discourse Between Mr. Hugh Peters and Leiut. Collonel John Lilborn in the Tower of London* (London, 1649).
55. Smith, *The University of Toronto Quarterly*, X, 474.
56. Hugh Peters, *Good Work for a Good Magistrate* (London, 1651), pp. 32-33; Sabine, *Winstanley*, p. 509.
57. Bulstrode Whitelock, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (New edition; Oxford, 1853), III, 388.
58. Sabine, *Winstanley*, p. 238.
59. Margaret James, "Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy," *History*, XXVII (June, 1941), pp. 9-11.
60. Collier, *A Discovery of the New Creation*, pp. 36-37; Thomas Collier, *A Brief Discovery of the Corruption of the Ministrie of the Church of England* (London, n. d.), pp. 6-7.
61. Saltmarsh, *An End of One Controversie*, p. 115; John Saltmarsh, *Smoke in the Temple*, p. 36, contained in *Some Drops of the Viall* (London, 1646).
62. (1653).
63. A. G. Matthews, ed., *Calamy Revised* (Oxford, 1934), s. v.; *Mercurius Elencticus*, October 29-November 5, 1647, p. 4.
64. William Dell, *The Stumbling-Stone* (London, 1653), p. 378.



## FROM COERCION TO PERSUASION: ANOTHER LOOK AT THE RISE OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND THE EMERGENCE OF DENOMINATIONALISM

SIDNEY E. MEAD, *University of Chicago*

### I

So far as religious affairs are concerned, the colonial period of our history begins with the planting of the first permanent English colony in 1607, guided by the intention to perpetuate in the new land the religious patterns to which the mother country had grown accustomed. Chief of these for our purposes was uniformity enforced by the civil power. The period culminates just 180 years later with the complete rejection of this central intention in the provisions for national religious freedom in the Constitution (1787) and First Amendment (1791).

Regarding these provisions Philip Schaff said, "Congress was shut up to this course by the previous history of the American colonies and the actual condition of things at the time of the formation of the national government."<sup>1</sup> In brief, it was recognized at the time that if there was to be a *United States of America*, there had to be religious freedom on the national scale. The following interpretation of developments during the colonial period is therefore guided by two questions: 1), what was this "actual condition of things?" and 2), how had it come to be?

### II

All the original ventures in settlement in the new world—including the English—were guided by the intention to establish for whatever reasons outposts of European empires where the general social, religious, and political patterns of the homelands would be perpetuated. By the time that English colonization got underway early in the 17th century, the Reformation movement had shattered the once tangible unity of European Christendom in one church. Inevitably the spiritual re-formation of the church had found affinities with the rising national consciousnesses, and had found protective power in the new states to oppose the physical power controlled by Rome. Thus the one re-formation of the church found diverse expressions in the new nations—Lutheranism in the realms of the German princes and in the Scandinavian countries. Anglicanism in England, Reformed in Geneva and Scotland. These are the so-called "right-wing" churches.

With differences unimportant at this point, these groups agreed with Roman Catholics on the necessity for religious uniformity in doctrine and practice within a civil state, and enforced by the civil

power. This view of more than ten centuries' standing in western Christendom they accepted as axiomatic.

Meanwhile in the social crevices created by universal upheaval certain "sects" or "left-wing" groups were emerging, as blades of grass soon thrust themselves up through the cracks once a cement sidewalk is broken. Throughout Europe both Catholics and Protestants universally tried to suppress these groups by force as heretics and schismatics who constituted a threat to the whole structure of Christianity and civilization as then conceived.

All the first settlements on that part of the continent that was to become English were made under the religious aegis of right-wing groups, with the exception of Plymouth where a handful of separatists "made a small, bustling noise in an empty land."<sup>2</sup> But Anglicans who were making a bigger noise on the James, as were Dutch Reformed on the Hudson, Swedes on the Delaware, and Puritan Congregationalists on the Charles, all assumed that the pattern of religious uniformity would of necessity be transplanted and perpetuated in the colonies. And all took positive steps to insure this—even the Pilgrims. For as Plymouth colony prospered it made support of the church compulsory, demanded that voters be certified as "orthodox in the fundamentals of religion," and passed laws against Quakers and other heretics.<sup>3</sup>

The first Charter of Virginia of 1606 provided that "the true word and service of God and Christian faith be preached, planted, and used . . . according to the doctrine, rights, and religion now professed and established within our realm of England," and from the beginning laws provided for the maintenance of the church and clergy and for conformity.

Orthodox ministers of the Dutch church came early to New Netherlands, and the new charter of freedoms and exemptions of 1640 stated that

no other religion shall be publicly admitted in New Netherlands except the Reformed, as it is at present preached and practiced by public authority in the United Netherlands; and for this purpose the Company shall provide and maintain good and suitable preachers, schoolmasters, and comforters of the sick.<sup>4</sup>

When John Prinz was sent as Governor to the struggling Swedish colony in 1643 he was specifically instructed to

labor and watch that he render in all things to Almighty God the true worship which is his due . . . and to take good measures that the divine service is performed according to the true confession of Augsburg, the Council of Upsala, and the ceremonies of the Swedish church . . .

After a brief stay he was happy to report that

Divine service is performed here in the good old Swedish tongue, our priest clothes in the vestments of the Mass on high festivals, solemn

prayer-days, Sundays, and Apostles' days, precisely as in old Sweden, and differing in every respect from that of the sects around us.<sup>5</sup>

That the New England Puritan's holy experiment in the Bible Commonwealth required uniformity hardly needs documentation. "There is no Rule given by God for any State to give an Affirmative Toleration to any false Religion, or Opinion whatsoever; they must connive in some Cases, but may not concede in any," was Nathaniel Ward's dictum. And although the forthright clarity of this "simple cobbler" was not typical of the usually more discreet apologists for the New England way, who perhaps did not welcome him as their self-appointed spokesman, nevertheless his sentiment was one of the stones in the foundation of their "due forme of Government both ciuill & ecclesiastical."

With these beginnings, it is notable that in contrast to the success in this respect of Roman Catholics in New France and the Spanish settlements in South and Central America, the intention to perpetuate uniformity in the several Protestant colonies that were gathered under the broad wings and "salutary neglect" of mother England during the 17th and 18th centuries, was everywhere frustrated, and the tradition of thirteen centuries' standing given up in the relatively brief time of 180 years. By around the middle of the 18th century "toleration" was universally, however reluctantly, accepted in all the colonies, and within fifty years complete religious freedom was declared to be the policy of the new nation.

The importance and significance of this change can hardly be overestimated. Professor W. E. Garrison has rightly called it one of "the two most profound revolutions which have occurred in the entire history of the church"—"on the administrative side"—and so it was.

Detailed historical explanation of this momentous change is not a primary purpose of this article. There have been many studies of the rise of religious liberty in America. They range all the way from the sentimental to the cynical, with a large number of very substantial works by careful scholars in between. There would seem to be fairly wide consensus on Professor Schaff's view that "Congress was shut up to this course." In explaining why this was so two factors are to be weighed and balanced. The first is that of the positive thrust for such freedom represented for example by the Baptists and given voice by individual leaders in most of the other groups. The second factor is that represented by Perry Miller's thesis that "by and large Protestants did not [willingly] contribute to religious liberty, they stumbled into it, they were compelled into it, they accepted it at last because they had to, or because they saw its strategic value."

It is my impression that Protestant writers have commonly stressed the first factor. And if in this article I stress the second factor, it is primarily for the purpose of bringing into the discussion what I hope will be a salutary and corrective emphasis. This emphasis necessarily somewhat discounts the historical importance among Protestants of a positive, self-conscious and articulated aspiration for religious freedom for all, such as gained a place in their popular folklore through such gems as Felicia Heman's poem on the landing of the Pilgrims. It does not deny the existence of the important seminal ideas among "left-wingers" and other outcasts such as the Roman Catholics who established Maryland, or even among the respectable Puritans and Presbyterians. Nor does it underestimate the long-term symbolic value of the halting steps taken along this road by the Baltimores, and the surer steps of Roger Williams, William Coddington and that motley collection of the banished in Providence, Portsmouth, and New Port, or those of William Penn and his Quakers in the Jerseys and Pennsylvania. But it should also be kept in mind that the freedom extended to all in early Maryland was connived in only so long as was necessary. Rhode Island was the scandal of respectable New England precisely because of its freedom, and was commonly referred to by the Bay dignitaries as the sewer and loathsome receptacle of the land, that was not cleansed because they could not. And by the time that Penn launched his holy experiment in Pennsylvania, coerced uniformity had already broken down in the neighboring colonies, and England herself, having experimented extensively with toleration between 1648 and 1660, and unable to forget it with Restoration, was trembling on the verge of toleration.

Accepting the view that the original intention of the dominant and powerful groups was to perpetuate the pattern of religious uniformity, the thesis here developed is that the intention was frustrated primarily by the unusual problems posed by the vast space with which the Planters had to deal in coming to the new land, by the complex web of self interest in which they were enmeshed, and the practical necessity which these imposed to "connive in some cases," and finally by effective pressures from the motherland. This thesis, which is merely a summary of common knowledge, need not be extensively documented here, but only briefly illustrated.

The web of self-interest was complex indeed, the strongest strands being Protestant, national and personal. At a time when in England Protestant was synonymous with patriot, and the first feeble English settlements were encircled by the strong arms of French and Spanish Catholicism, whose fingers touched on the Mississippi, it is small wonder that all the early writings and charters stressed the planting of *Protestant* outposts of empire, and that a sentiment came to pre-

vail that almost any kind of Protestantism was preferable to Catholicism. Perhaps this is why Dutch and English policy differed radically from French, in that the Protestant countries after a few random gestures such as the provision in the second Virginia Charter of 1609 that "none be permitted to pass in any Voyage . . . to be made into said Country but such as first shall have taken the Oath of Supremacy," let their dissenters go. Civil and ecclesiastical pressures ranging from slight disabilities to active persecution thus added an external push from the rear to the lure of land and of economic and social betterment operating in the colonists' minds. And this, coupled in many of them with a religious fervor that was always in danger of crossing the boundary into self-righteousness, pushed them out with the intention to become permanent settlers, to possess the land, and perchance to be an example for all mankind—as witness the Bay Puritans.

It is notable also that from the beginning the one outstanding Roman Catholic proprietor had to tolerate a majority of Protestants in his colony, and that eventually the heirs of the first Baltimore probably retained their lands and prerogatives only by becoming Protestants.

National self-interest merged of course with Protestant and hatched a desire for strong and profitable colonies that tended to overcome squeamishness about the religious complexion of the settlers. Thus when Peter Stuyvesant, the new Director General, came to New Netherlands in 1647, he immediately took steps to put the religious house in order by limiting the sale of liquor on Sundays, instituting preaching twice rather than the former once a day, and compelling attendance thereon. When Lutherans, Jews and Quakers arrived he tried to suppress them, finally shipping one notorious Quaker back to Holland. The Directors' reaction to this move is eloquent testimony to the mind that prevailed among them. They wrote in April 1663 that

...although it is our cordial desire that similar and other sectarians might not be found there, yet as the contrary seems to be the fact, we doubt very much if vigorous proceedings against them ought not to be discontinued, except you intend to check and destroy your population; which, however, in the youth of your existence ought rather to be encouraged by all possible means: Wherefore, it is our opinion, that some connivance would be useful; that the consciences of men, at least, ought ever to remain free and unshackled. Let everyone be unmolested, as long as he is modest; as long as his conduct in a political sense is irreproachable; as long as he does not disturb others, or oppose the government. This maxim of moderation has always been the guide of the magistrates of this city, and the consequence has been that, from every land, people have flocked to this asylum. Tread then in their steps, and, we doubt not, you will be blessed.<sup>8</sup>

So on another occasion Stuyvesant argued that "to give liberty

to the Jews will be very detrimental . . . because the Christians there will not be able at the same time to do business." And besides, "giving them liberty, we cannot refuse the Lutherans and Papists."<sup>9</sup>

At the time he was backed by the doughty Reformed Minister, Megapolensis, who thought the situation was already bad enough since there were "Papists, Mennonites and Lutherans amongst the Dutch, also many Puritans or Independents, and various other servants of Baal among the English under this government," all of whom "conceal themselves under the name of Christians."<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless the desire of the Directors not to "check and destroy" the population overruled the desire of both magistrate and clergy for semblance of religious uniformity and Jews had to be granted permission to reside and traffic in New Netherlands only "provided they shall not become a charge upon the deaconry or the Company."<sup>11</sup>

Finally, from the beginning the ruling geniuses of the new age of expansion managed to mingle strong personal self-interest with the more abstract Protestant and national by making trading companies and proprietaryships the instruments of planting. Dutch, Swedish, and English companies made possible the plantings in Virginia, Plymouth, New Netherlands, Massachusetts Bay, and Delaware, while proprietors instrumented the founding of Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, the Carolinas, Pennsylvania, and Georgia. And it might be argued that William Coddington and his commercially minded cohorts were the real backbone of Rhode Island, while obviously Theophilus Eaton the merchant was hand in hand with John Davenport the minister in the founding of the ultra-theocratic New Haven.

By 1685, says Greene, "more territory along the seaboard than New England and Virginia combined" was under proprietary control, and there "governmental policies in relation to religion were radically different from those prevailing either in New England or Virginia." From the viewpoint of the proprietors, he continues, "it was obviously not good business to set up religious tests to exclude otherwise desirable immigrants." Hence, "the proprietors tried to attract settlers by promising, if not full religious equality, at least greater tolerance than was allowed elsewhere."<sup>12</sup>

But if self-interest dictated in more or less subtle and devious ways a kind of connivance with religious diversity that helped to spell out toleration in the colonies, the efforts even of the most authoritarian groups to enforce uniformity on principle were dissipated in the vast spaces of the new land.

The Anglicans tried it in Virginia, even resorting in 1611-12 to the savage "Lavves Diuine, Morall and Martiall &c." which threatened the death penalty for speaking "impiously or maliciously against



the . . . Trinitie," or "against the knowne Articles of the Christian faith," or for saying or doing anything which might "tend to the derision, or despight of Gods Holy Word," and threatened loss of the "dayes allowance," whipping, "a bodkin thrust through his tongue," six months in the "Gallies," or other punishments "according to the martiall law in that case provided" for failing, among other things, in respect for the clergy, for failing to attend "diuine Service" twice daily, for breaking the "Sabboth by any gaming, publique or private, or refusing religious instruction."<sup>13</sup>

No one supposes that such laws were enforced during the horrendous years between 1607 and 1624 when thirteen of the fourteen thousand people sent over died from exposure, disease, starvation, and the weapons of the savages. By that time the remaining settlers were scattered on plantations along the rivers and even honest clergymen despaired of conducting the routine affairs of the English Church in parishes that might be 100 miles in length. In 1661 an acute observer argued in *Virginia's Cure* . . . that the chief difficulty was due to the "scattered Planting" for which there was "no other Remedy . . . but by reducing her Planters into towns." He proposed, therefore, to raise money in England to send workers to Virginia to build towns in every county, and then to make the planters bring their families and servants in to these centers on week ends and there submit to regular catechetical instruction and church attendance.<sup>14</sup> Obviously this was the counsel of despairing, albeit ardent, churchmen who were beginning to realize that the snug parish life of settled England could not be duplicated in the wilderness.

The Puritan theocrats on the Charles early grasped one important aspect of the meaning of the great space available for all. Nathaniel Ward, presuming to speak for Massachusetts Bay, proclaimed that "all Familists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, and other Enthusiasts, shall have free liberty to keep away from us, and such as will come to be gone as fast as they can, the sooner the better."<sup>15</sup> Back of this of course was the thought that there was plenty of room "to be gone" in, and John Cotton but took the next obvious step when in partial justification for forcing some to leave he blandly stated that

The Jurisdiction (whence a man is banished) is but small, and the Countrey round about it, large and fruitful: where a man may make his choice of variety of more pleasant, and profitable seats, than he leaveth behinde him. In which respect, Banishment in this countrey, is not counted so much a confinement, as an enlargement.<sup>16</sup>

Cotton probably never understood just how much of an "enlargement" it might be, and how it would help to undermine the Puritan citadel itself. For while the Puritans were intent on protecting their own religious absolutism by inducing Antinomians, Bap-

tists, Quakers and other dissenters "to be gone as fast as they can," they overlooked the implications of the fact that they could neither keep them from settling in neighboring Rhode Island where "Justice did at greatest offenders wink,"<sup>17</sup> nor prevent every wind from the south carrying the contagion of their ideas back into the Puritan stronghold. They could not foresee that the same inscrutable Providence that gave Puritans the opportunity to build their kind of Bible commonwealth on Massachusetts soil, would offer dissenters the opportunity to build whatever kind of commonwealth they wished on Rhode Island soil. But when they saw that happen in spite of all their efforts to bring Providence and the Islanders under their godly control, they came to see that they had to connive in it.

Meanwhile, the zeal of the dissenters, far from being dissipated by banishment, was truly "enlarged" by the knowledge thus forced upon them that even the long arms of civil and ecclesiastical authority could not encompass the vast spaces of the new land. Although four stubborn Quakers, who refused to accept the "free liberty to keep away," were effectively and permanently suppressed in Boston with the hangman's noose, the majority of dissenters in America soon learned to escape the deadly vertical pressures of entrenched authority by the simple expedient of moving horizontally in the free space. In rather short order, belief in the effectiveness of suppression by force, and hence the will to use it to maintain uniformity, was undermined by the obvious futility of attempts to land solid and decisive blows on the subversive little men and women who were seldom there when the blows fell. Samuel Gorton, after being forced to attend church in the Bay, wrote that the sermonic fare seemed adapted to the digestive capacities of the ostrich. But in spite of such supposed capacities, the residents seem to have been unable to stomach the savage proceedings against the Quakers, and finally even the magistrates and ministers had to connive in their existence.<sup>18</sup>

In the process the dissenters waxed strong and saucy—a development that could not go unnoticed by those within the traditional folds, where many citizens began willy-nilly to nourish within themselves a desire to emulate this exhibition of a new kind of freedom made possible in the wilderness. They began to people all neighboring colonies.

There was of course another aspect of space—the distance from the motherland, which, relative to existing means of movement and communication, was immense. The Puritans began with the idea that

... God hath provided this place to be a refuge for many whome he meanes to save out of the generall calamity, and seeinge the Church hath noe place to flie into but the wilderness, what better worke can there be, then to goe and provide tabernacles and foode for her against she comes thither.<sup>19</sup>



They early sensed the protection inherent in the great distance, as is evidenced by their ingenious idea of taking the Charter and the Company bodily to New England. Thereafter they perfected a system of sanctified maneuvering within the time granted by distance that frustrated all attempts of English courts and crown to control them for about three generations.

The same factor militated against any effective control and discipline of the transplanted Church of England in the southern colonies. From the beginning oversight fell somewhat accidentally to the Bishops of London, who during the last quarter of the 17th century sought to instrument their supervision through representatives called commissaries. But failing to secure resident bishops, effective supervision proved impossible, and the church languished under too many second rate and even fraudulent clergymen and fell increasingly under the control of parochial vestries made up of local citizens.

Turmoil in England at times reinforced distance in frustrating effective ecclesiastical control of the colonies. In 1638, after a series of reports and proclamations beginning in 1632, Archbishop Laud made arrangements to send a bishop to New England with sufficient forces if necessary to enforce conformity and obedience. But the outbreak of troubles in Scotland sidetracked this interesting project, and "there are no records of any official connection between the Anglican Episcopate and the Colonies during the period 1638-1663."<sup>20</sup>

Meanwhile through revolution, Protectorate and Restoration, England was moving toward its rendezvous with the kind of toleration made manifest in the famous Act of 1689. Already in 1652 Dr. John Clarke had published in London his *Ill Newes from Newe England or a Narrative of New England's Persecution*, in protest against the fining and whipping of three Baptists in Massachusetts under the aegis of a law passed in 1644. His telling thesis was that in matters of religious tolerance, "while Old England is becoming new, New England is become Old."<sup>21</sup> From about that time the mother country did interfere increasingly and effectively to curb intolerance and persecution in the colonies. Perhaps this should be seen as an aspect of national self-interest.

Thus the King "having got a book written by George Bishop containing a relation of the cruel persecution [of Quakers] in New England,"<sup>22</sup> and having learned from Edward Burrough of the execution of William Leddra in Boston and "the danger that others were in of going the same way," there being "a vein of innocent blood opened in his dominions, which if it were not stopped would overrun all," declared " 'But I will stop it' "—and he did. "A mandamus was forthwith granted" and carried to New England by Samuel Shattock, a resident of Salem who had been banished on pain of death. Shattock

and his fellow Quakers made the most of the occasion, which resulted in a suspension of the laws against the Quakers as such in November, 1661.

Meanwhile, John Clarke's *Ill Newes from New England* . . . had resulted in a protest to the Governor of Massachusetts from ten Congregational ministers in London, who, seeking for more toleration in England, were embarrassed by this show of intolerance on the part of their New England brethren. Sir Richard Saltonstall added his protest in a letter to Cotton and Wilson of Boston's First Church, and their reply that it was better to have "hypocrites than profane persons" in their churches and domain sounded outmoded.<sup>23</sup>

In 1663 the Crown, in giving its consent to Rhode Island's "livelie experiment" with "full libertie in religious concernments" in the new Charter,<sup>24</sup> gave official sanction to the scandal of Massachusetts Bay and forestalled all future attempts on the part of the Bay Puritans to impose their kind of theocratic order on the neighboring chaos.

But probably the most spectacular case of royal interference that worked for the broadening of toleration in the colonies was the revocation of the Massachusetts Bay Charter in 1684 and the coming of Sir Edmund Andros as the Royal Governor in 1686. For Andros brought an Anglican chaplain with him, and after trying persuasion on the taciturn Puritan ministers he finally took over one of their meeting houses with force and had the English services conducted therein while King's Chapel was being built. The new charter of 1691, in which the New Englanders themselves had a part through the person and work of Increase Mather, wrote "the end" to the Puritan chapter on the preservation of uniformity in the new land.

### III

By around 1720, then, the original intention to perpetuate religious uniformity had been almost universally frustrated in the colonies by the strange rope of circumstances woven from various kinds of self interest and the problems growing out of the great space confronted. Effective interference from the motherland in the interests of broader toleration served only to hasten the process. When the two Mathers, father and son, took part in the ordination of a Baptist minister in Boston in 1718, they thereby indicated that some churchmen sensed that a new day was dawning. But it is probably not to be wondered at that most of them adhered to the inherited standards and conceptions of the church with religious fervor sometimes bordering on desperation. It took the prolonged upheavals associated with the great revivals to break the hold of the old patterns, give the new an opportunity to grow, and inextricably to scramble both with others emerging out of the immediate situation.

Once it was seen that uniformity was impracticable, two possible

paths lay open before the churches: toleration, with a favored or established church and dissenting sects—the path actually taken in England—or freedom, with complete equality of all religious groups before the civil law. In this situation it is important to note that transplanted offshoots of Europe's state churches were clearly dominant in all but two of the colonies, and indeed remained so until after the Revolution. Further, nine of the colonies actually maintained establishments—Congregationalism in New England, Anglicanism in the south and, nominally, in part of New York—while none of the other dominant churches as yet rejected the idea on principle, and indeed, as witness Presbyterians in the south and Anglicans in New England, were willing to acknowledge the prerogatives of establishments by assuming the role of dissenters. On the eve of the great revivals, then, the prevailing sentiment in these churches is probably best described as tolerationist based on necessary connivance.

Meanwhile in Rhode Island and the stronger middle colonies religious freedom prevailed—in New York practically, ambiguously, and largely because of necessity, in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania actually and more clearly on principle and experience. Further, as has been intimated, the factors that had confounded the uniformitarian intentions of the churches originally established in the new land, had also encouraged the numerical growth, geographical expansion and bumptious self-confidence of the dissenting and the free groups in all the colonies. However, these were as yet largely unconscious of their real strength for facing the future, which lay in their necessary espousal of voluntarism as the basis for a church, and their consequent experience with dependence upon persuasion alone for recruiting members and maintaining their institutions in competition with other groups. An entry in Henry M. Muhlenberg's *Journal*, November 28, 1742, suggests how rapidly a minister, transplanted from a European state church might size up the realities of the new situation in America and come to terms with them. Sent over to bring some order into the scrambled Lutheran affairs, he immediately ran into a squabble in one of the churches, and recorded:

The deacons and elders are unable to do anything about it, for in religious and church matters, each has the right to do what he pleases. The government has nothing to do with it and will not concern itself with such matters. Everything depends on the vote of the majority. A preacher must fight his way through with the sword of the Spirit alone and depend upon faith in the living God and His promises, if he wants to be a preacher and proclaim the truth [in America].<sup>25</sup>

Such espousal of voluntarism by these American offspring of Europe's right-wing state churches meant, of course, that they accepted one aspect that of necessity had been common to the left-wing sectarian groups of Europe from their beginnings. But this was a triumph of

a left-wing influence in America, as is sometimes held, only in a "guilt by association" sense.

Much more important for the future than left-wing influence was the movement called Pietism, which had originated in the European right-wing state churches during the last quarter of the seventeenth century under leaders who sought to provide more palatable spiritual food for the hungry souls of the common folk who were then languishing on Protestant scholasticism and formalism. Conceived and projected by its leaders as a movement *within* churches aimed at the revitalization of the personal religious life of the members and a restoration of Christian unity, Pietism did tend to develop its own patterns of doctrine and polity. While assuming the validity and continuance of traditional standards and practices, Pietists tended to make personal religious experience more important than assent to correctly formulated belief and the observance of ecclesiastical forms—which was to intimate that the essence of a church was the voluntary association of individuals who had had the experience. Stress on the intuitive religion of the heart "strangely warmed" by "faith in Christ," as John Wesley was later to put it, was of course a possible seed bed for the dreaded religious "enthusiasm." However, in Europe the movement was always somewhat constrained by the sheer existence and accepted forms of the powerful state churches.

But, sprouting indigenously in their American counterparts, or transplanted thereto by such leaders as Freylinghuysen, Muhlenberg, Zinzendorf, and the great Whitefield, where such constraining ecclesiastical forms were already weakened, Pietism, cross-fertilized by other movements, grew rankly and blossomed in the spectacular phenomena associated with the Great Awakenings that swept the colonies from the 1720s to the Revolution, transforming the religious complexion of the land.

Jonathan Edwards' experience in Northampton indicates how short was the step from preaching even the most traditional doctrines out of a heart "strangely warmed," to the outbreak of a surprising revival in the church that soon led to "strange enthusiastic delusions" which threatened to disrupt established parish customs.<sup>26</sup> And to a modern student the emotional upheavals created by George Whitefield's preaching seem to be out of proportion even to that noted evangelist's reputed powers that so impressed Benjamin Franklin.

Back of this was the peculiar religious situation that had been developing in the colonies for a century. Concurrent with the frustration of the ideal of uniformity had come the obvious decline of vital religion and morality which so concerned religious leaders throughout the colonies during the twilight years of the seventeenth century, and turned so many of their sermons and official pronounce-

ments into lamentations for the departed glory of the founders. Apparently the churches were not reaching the masses of the people effectively or with power, and they confronted a greater proportion of unchurched in the population than existed in any other country in Christendom.

Closely related of course was the breakdown of the traditional pattern of church membership by birth into a commonwealth and baptism into a church that was coextensive with it, together with the passing of support encouraged by the persuasive inducement of coercion—while as yet no new, effective and acceptable method for recruiting and holding members had emerged.

Over all was the general cultural attrition associated with living on the frontier of western civilization, which consumed so much of the vital energy of the prosperous in practical affairs—usually related to immediate profits—and of the poor in the even more engrossing problem of survival. The end of the seventeenth century has been called with reason the lowest ebb tide of the cultural amenities in America. Here was fertile soil for the growth of the kind of fearful and superstitious religiosity later so vividly pictured by Crèvecoeur in the twelfth of his *Letters from an American Farmer*. Hence, to change the figure, at the very time when the tried old dams of civil and ecclesiastical law and custom were crumbling, there was building up behind them in the population a religious yearning waiting to be released in floods of religious "enthusiasm." And the revivals came, doing just that.

Most of the early revivalists were pietistically inclined ministers who more or less unwittingly stumbled upon this technique that so perfectly met the immediate needs of the churches as plausibly to be looked upon as a direct answer to their prayers and a sign of the divine approbation of their doctrines.<sup>27</sup> They were obviously successful in carrying the claims of the gospel to the masses of indifferent people, in recruiting members from among the large body of the unchurched, and in filling the pews with convinced and committed Christians. While thus checking the ominous drift toward religious decline, the revivals demonstrated the unimagined effectiveness of persuasion alone to churches recently shorn, or rapidly being shorn, of coercive power. This helped to relieve their present confusion, and raised their languishing hopes for the future.

In the context of our general interpretation it is important to note two things. The first is that the revivals took place largely within the entrenched and dominant churches of right-wing tradition. The second is that everywhere, whether among Dutch Reformed and Presbyterians in the middle colonies, Congregationalists in New England or Anglicans in the south, they resulted in a head-on clash be-

tween the pietistic revivalists and the powerful defenders of the traditional authoritarian Protestant patterns of doctrine and polity. For the latter correctly sensed that the revivalists, in keeping with their pietistic sentiments, stressed religious experience and results—namely conversions—more than correctness of belief, adherence to creedal statements, and proper observance of inherited forms, and hence that their work in the churches tended to wash out all traditional standards.

When the revivals broke out, traditionalists were largely in control in all these churches. Their attitude is fairly reflected in the Old Side Presbyterian condemnation of the revivalists for

preaching the terrors of the law in such a manner and dialect as has no precedent in the Word of God . . . and so industriously working on the passions and affections of weak minds, as to cause them to cry out in a hideous manner, and fall down in convulsion-like fits, to the marring of the profiting both of themselves and others, who are so taken up in seeing and hearing these odd symptoms, that they cannot attend to or hear what the preacher says; and then, after all, boasting of these things as the work of God, which we are persuaded do proceed from an inferior or worse cause.<sup>28</sup>

And as for the greatest of the revivalists, the Rev. John Thompson wrote that he was "almost fully persuaded" that George Whitefield was either "a downright Deceiver, or else under a dreadful Delusion," and his publications "nothing but mere confused inconsistent religious jargon, contrived to amuse and delude the simple."<sup>29</sup>

Feeling a strong sense of responsibility for order and decency in the churches, and still being powerful enough to do so, these men in every area used every civil and ecclesiastical weapon they could against the revivalists and their ways.

The revivalists defended themselves primarily on the basis of their sense of the importance of personal religious experience, which they thought the traditionalists neglected. Gilbert Tennent struck their key note in his sermon of March 8, 1740 which he called "The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry." Such ministers, he asserted, are "Pharisee-teachers, having no experience of a special work of the Holy Ghost, upon their own souls. They are merely "carnal," and have

discover'd themselves too plainly to be so, in the Course of their lives; some by Ignorance of the Things of God, and Errors about them, bantering and ridiculing of them; some by vicious Practices, some both Ways, all by a furious Opposition to the Work of God in the Land; and what need have we of further Witnesses?

Of course, he added, "God, as an absolute Sovereign, may use what Means he pleases to accomplish his Work by," *but* "we only assert this, that Success by unconverted Ministers Preaching is very improbable, and very seldom happens, so far as we can gather."<sup>30</sup>

Here was the revivalists' most telling argument—they were obviously more successful than their traditionalist brethren and, for



example, the experience of the divided Presbyterian churches between 1745 and 1758 amounted to a demonstration. At the time of the separation the Old Side party numbered 25 ministers, at its close only 22. Meanwhile the New Side revivalist party which began with 22 ministers, had 72 in 1758—and churches and members were proportionately in keeping with these figures. The success of the revivalists could be made very tangible, and nicely measured merely by counting ministers, churches and converts. Thereafter the emphasis upon it was to play havoc with all traditionally rooted standards of doctrine and polity in the American churches. One hundred and fifty years later Dwight L. Moody was to declare that it makes no difference how you got a man to God, just so you got him there—and there is a direct line of descent from the colonial revivalists to their nineteenth century heir.

At this point it is worthwhile to note specifically that the battle was not one between tolerant "left wing" sectarian revivalists riding the wave of the democratic future, and anachronistic "right-wing" churchmen stubbornly defending the past and their own present prerogatives. It is important to stress this, because even Professor W. W. Sweet, dean of the historians of Christianity in America, gave the prestige of his name to the thesis that "it was the triumph of left-wing Protestantism in eighteenth century colonial America which underlay the final achievement of the separation of church and state."<sup>31</sup> This thesis has difficulties, chief of which is the plain fact that the left-wing, whether defined institutionally or ideologically, never "triumphed" during the colonial period in America.<sup>32</sup>

To be sure the pietistic revivalists everywhere belabored what Tennent had called "The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry," and Jonathan Edwards was dismissed from his Northampton church in 1750 primarily for insisting in that stronghold of right-wing sentiment locally known as "Stoddardeanism," that a conversion experience was the prime requisite for full communion in a Christian church—something he had perhaps learned in the revivals. Further, under the widespread harassment and persecution emanating from the traditionalists, the revivalists naturally developed a kind of anti-clericalism and anti-ecclesiasticism that helped to blur the lines between them and those of more authentic left-wing tradition. And from the time of Münster every departure from accepted order in the Protestant churches was apt to conjure up visions of an imminent upsurge of familism, antinomianism, anabaptism, and enthusiasm—terms that the traditionalists used loosely in the heat of controversy, further compounding the confusion between their opponents and the left-wing.

But actually all the outstanding revivalists belonged to churches of right-wing tradition, and it might cogently be argued that what

growth accrued to left-wing groups as a result of the revivals came largely through their ability to reap where others had sown. Thus, for example, the Baptists in New England apparently took little part in the Awakenings there, looking upon them as a movement within the churches of their Congregational oppressors.<sup>33</sup> But when conflict led to a separatist movement, and Separate Congregationalists were treated even more harshly than Baptists by their erstwhile brethren who remained in the established churches, many separatists became Baptists.

Once this point is clear, we may note that during the clash between traditionalists and revivalists, the latter were thrown willy-nilly—but somewhat incidentally—on the side of greater toleration and freedom. It was not that they developed clearly formulated theories about religious freedom—in fact the striking thing about the whole pietistic movement, as A. N. Whitehead pointed out, was that it “was singularly devoid of new ideas,” never appealed to any “great intellectual construction explanatory of its modes of understanding,” and its sweep in the churches marks the point at which “the clergy of the Western races began to waver in their appeal to constructive reason.”<sup>34</sup> What they appealed to was religious experience and feeling, and as John Wesley said of his Methodists, they spread “scriptural religion throughout the land, among people of every denomination; leaving every one to hold his own opinions, and to follow his own mode of worship.”<sup>35</sup> Methodists, he said,

do not impose in order to their admission, any opinions whatever. Let them hold particular or general redemption, absolute or conditional decrees; let them be churchmen or dissenters, Presbyterians or Independents, it is no obstacle. Let them choose one mode of baptism or another, it is no bar to their admission. The Presbyterian may be a Presbyterian still; the Independent and the Anabaptist use his own worship still. So may the Quaker and none will contend with him about it. They think and let think. One condition and only one is required — a real desire to save the soul. Where this is it is enough; they desire no more; they lay stress upon nothing else; they only ask, “Is thy heart herein as my heart? If it be, give me thy hand.”<sup>36</sup>

Although seldom so clearly expressed, this is the kind of outlook that the revivals tended to sponsor in the churches. Obviously men of such sentiments could be expected to have little interest in the continuance of uniformity or of establishments. But by the same token, neither can they be expected to have had, or to have developed, any well rounded theories about anything, religious freedom included. Hence such freedom as the revivalists came to represent during the controversies was not generated by a theoretical consideration of its ultimate desirability on principle, but by a practical desire for freedom from the immediate restraints and oppressions imposed by the dominant churchmen. What they fought for at the time was the freedom to publish their own point of view in their own way, unmolested by traditional

civil and ecclesiastical customs and laws—which to their mind served primarily to prevent getting the show on the road. Traditionalist spokesmen, such as the Rev. John Thompson, snorted at the inadequacy of this conception, and with some insight wished the revivalists “freedom from their captivating Delusion.”<sup>37</sup> But here the revivalists *were* riding the wave of the future, and theirs was to become in Protestant America, the most prevalent conception of the meaning of religious freedom.<sup>38</sup>

Meanwhile the rationalist permeation of the intellectual world during the eighteenth century meant that any man or group that appeared to be fighting for wider toleration of religious differences would attract the sympathetic attention of “enlightened” men in positions of social and political leadership. Furthermore, these men *were* interested in giving such freedom rational theoretical justification.

The rationalist, as befitted the learned, found that “the essentials of every religion” could be summarized in a set of intellectual propositions regarding God, immortality, and the life of virtue. And, as Benjamin Franklin suavely put it, these being

found in all the religions we had in our country, I respected them all, tho’ with different degrees of respect, as I found them more or less mix’d with other articles, which, without any tendency to inspire, promote or conform morality, serv’d principally to divide us, and make us unfriendly to one another.

Back of this genial but discriminating respect for all, was “the opinion that the worst had some good effects.”<sup>39</sup> What “good effects” these men had in mind, Thomas Jefferson made clear. Surveying his “sister states of Pennsylvania and New York” in 1781 or ’82, he noted that there were religions “of various kinds, indeed, but all good enough; [because] all sufficient to preserve peace and order.”<sup>40</sup> This, he thought, amounted to a practical demonstration that uniformity of religious belief and practice in a civil commonwealth was not essential to the public welfare, as had been assumed in Christendom for many centuries.

The rationalists’ theoretical defense of freedom was based on the view that since religion is one’s “opinion” about the “duty which we owe to our creator, and the manner of discharging it,” and “the opinions of men” depend “only on the evidence contemplated in their own minds” and “cannot follow the dictates of other men,”<sup>41</sup> therefore, true uniformity is impossible except insofar as it can be achieved through persuasion alone. Coercion, in the interests of uniformity, said Jefferson, had served only “to make one half the world fools, and the other half hypocrites.”<sup>42</sup> So while the pietists, stressing religious experience, were feeling their way to a lack of interest in uniformity, the rationalists were thinking their way toward religious freedom, and concluding by the way that “uniformity of opinion” is no more desirable “than of face and stature.”<sup>43</sup>

Here, as in other areas, rationalists and pietists were closer together in practical interests and conclusions than is many times supposed. Very important in this respect was the rationalists' high regard for the teachings of Jesus, whom they considered the first great Deist. His teachings, Jefferson held, constituted "the most sublime and benevolent code of morals which has ever been offered to man"<sup>44</sup> and on them he and his cohorts based their attack on existing ecclesiastical institutions, arguing that in the light of them the story of the church through the ages was largely a history of the corruptions of Christianity "for the purpose of deriving from it pence and power"—as Joseph Priestley attempted to demonstrate in his two volumes published in 1793.<sup>45</sup>

Men of this mind, however much they might abhor "enthusiasm," could take a sympathetic view of the practical moral application of the revivalists' gospel, and the concomitant pietistic appeal to the teachings and simple religion of Jesus. Naturally, then, as rationalists observed the controversies in and between the religious "sects" occasioned by the revivals, and the attempts of entrenched traditionalists to preserve order through the use of all possible means, including coercion, their sympathies were with the revivalists who appeared to be on the side of freedom. Hence rationalists many times in effect became in the legislatures the spokesmen for and defenders of the revivalistic "sectarians"—as, for example, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in Virginia.

Hence came that apparently strange coalition of rationalists with pietistic-revivalistic sectarians during the last quarter of the eighteenth century that provided so much of the power that lay behind the final thrust for national religious freedom that was written into the fundamental laws of the new nation. This coalition seems less strange if we keep in mind that at the time religious freedom was for both more a practical and legal problem than a theoretical one, and that they agreed on the practical goal.

#### IV

Finally then, to hark back to Schaff's thesis, we have traced the "previous history of the American colonies" that is pertinent to our understanding of the consequent "condition of things at the time of the formation of the national government." This "condition of things" can now be briefly summarized.

First, the churches of right-wing background were still dominant in every area. But no one of them, and no possible combination of them, was in a position to make a bid for a national establishment plausible, although those of the Calvinistic tradition were numerous and powerful enough to give Jefferson reason to fear the possibility.<sup>46</sup> Meanwhile, the sweep of pietistic sentiments through these churches during the revivals had undermined much of their desire for establish-

ment. On the question of religious freedom for all, there were many shades of opinion in these churches, but all were practically unanimous on one point—each wanted freedom for itself. And by this time it had become clear that the only way to get it for themselves was to grant it to all others.

Second, the situation had actually made all previous distinctions between established churches and sects, between right and left-wing groups, practically meaningless. In the south all but the Anglican Church were dissenting sects, as in New England were all but Congregational churches, and in this respect there was no difference between historically right-wing groups such as Presbyterians, Lutherans, and Anglicans, and historically left-wing groups such as Quakers and Baptists. The latter, of course, had traditionally held for religious freedom on principle, while the former had recently come to accept it of necessity. But since the immediate problem of such freedom was practical and legal, all worked together for it—each for his own complete freedom to publish his own point of view in his own way.

Hence the true picture is not that of the "triumph" in America of right-wing or left-wing, of churches or sects, but rather a mingling through frustration, controversy, confusion, and compromise forced by necessity, of all the diverse ecclesiastical patterns transplanted from Europe, plus other patterns improvised on the spot, to form a complex pattern of religious thought and institutional life that was peculiarly "American," and is probably best described as "denominationalism."

Meanwhile, most of the effectively powerful intellectual, social and political leaders were rationalists, and these men made sense theoretically out of the actual practical situation which demanded religious freedom, and gave it tangible form and legal structure. This the churches, each intent on its own freedom, accepted in practice but without reconciling themselves to it intellectually by developing theoretical defenses of it that were legitimately rooted in their professed theological positions. And they never have. Anson Phelps Stokes' massive three volume work on *Church and State in the United States*, which proceeds over the historical evidence like a vacuum cleaner over a rug, is notable for the paucity of positive Protestant pronouncements on religious freedom that it sweeps up.

It thus appears that the religious groups that were everywhere dominant in America throughout the colonial period seem to have placed their feet unwittingly on the road to religious freedom. Rather than following the cloud and pillar of articulated aspiration in that direction and to that consummation, they finally granted it (insofar as any can be said to have "granted" it) not as the kind of cheerful givers their Lord is said to love, but grudgingly and of necessity.



Meanwhile, by the time that the original intention to preserve religious uniformity was seen to be impossible of fulfillment in the new land, there had been incubated, largely within the dissenting groups (which were not necessarily "left-wing"), ideas, theories, practices that pointed the way toward a new kind of "church" in Christendom consistent with the practice of religious freedom. During the upheavals of the Great Awakenings in the colonies, these dissenters' patterns of thought and practice infiltrated the dominant churches, and through confusion and compromise there began that historical merging of the traditional patterns of "church" and "sect," "right" and "left" wings as known in Europe into the new kind of organization combining features of both plus features growing out of the immediate situation. The resulting organizational form was unlike anything that had preceded it in Christendom, and for purposes of distinctive clarity it is best known as the "denomination."<sup>47</sup>

1. Philip Schaff, *Church and State in the United States*. New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons, 1888. p. 23.
2. Stephen Vincent Benet, *Western Star*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1943. p. 144.
3. Evarts B. Greene, *Religion and the State: The Making and Testing of an American Tradition*. New York: N. Y. University Press, 1941. p. 37. See also Joseph P. Thompson, *Church and State in the United States*. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., 1873. p. 55.
4. As quoted in Frederick J. Zwierlein, *Religion in New Netherland*. Rochester, N. Y.: John P. Smith Printing Co., 1910, pp. 140-41.
5. As quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 117, 118-19.
6. Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson, *The Puritans*. New York: American Book Company, 1938. p. 231.
7. See the article, "The Contribution of the Protestant Churches to Religious Liberty in America," *Church History*, IV (March 1935), pp. 57-66.
8. As quoted in William Warren Sweet, *Religion in Colonial America*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942. pp. 151-52.
9. Zwierlein, *Religion in New Netherland*, p. 261.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 257.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 256.
12. Greene, *Religion and the State*, pp. 52-53.
13. *For the Colony in Virginia Britannia. Lavves Divine, Moral and Martiall, &c.* Printed at London for Walter Burre, 1612. In Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers*, vol. III, #ii. Washington: Wm. Q. Force, 1844, pp. 10-11.
14. *Virginia's Cure: Or an Advisive Narrative Concerning Virginia. Discovering the True Ground of That Churches Unhappiness, and the Only True Remedy.* As it was presented to the Right Reverend Father in God Gvilbert Lord Bishop of London, September 2, 1661. London: W. Godbid, 1662. In Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers*, vol. III, #xv. Washington: Wm. Q. Force, 1844.
15. Miller and Johnson, *The Puritans*, p. 27.
16. "A Reply to Mr. Williams His Examination: and Answer of the Letters Sent to Him by John Cotton" (*Publications of the Narragansett Club*, 1st Series, Vol. II [Providence, 1862], p. 19), quoted by Karl H. Hertz, "Bible Commonwealth and Holy Experiment" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1948,) p. 148.
17. Miller and Johnson, *The Puritans*, p. 638.
18. For the general factors at work, see the article by Roland Bainton, "The Struggle for Religious Liberty," *Church History*, X (June 1941), 95-124. Professor Winthrop S. Hudson has suggested that English Independents had developed a "denominational" conception of the Church, which in spite of the rigors of the New England way tended always to make its leaders inherently uncomfortable with persecution of dissenters. See his article, "Denominationalism as a Basis for Ecumenicity: A Seventeenth Century Conception," *Church History*, XXIV (March 1955), 32-50. This suggests a fruitful area for further exploration.
19. As quoted in Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934. I, 386.



20. Arthur Lyon Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924. p. 22.
21. In the *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, Series 4, vol. 2, 1854, pp. 1-113.
22. William Sewel, *The History of The Quakers, Intermixed with Several Remarkable Occurrences*. Written originally in low Dutch, and translated by himself into English. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1856. I, 354-55. This history first appeared in English in 1722.
23. See Sanford H. Cobb, *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902, p. 69.
24. Green, *Religion and the State*, p. 51.
25. *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, trans. Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942. I, 67.
26. See Edwards' "A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God, in the Conversion of Many Hundred Souls, in Northampton. . . ." in *The Works of President Edwards*. New York: S. Converse, 1830, IV, 70-71.
27. As, for example, Jonathan Edwards' words: "The Beginning of the late work of God in this Place was so circumstanced, that I could not but look upon it as a remarkable Testimony of God's Approbation of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, here asserted and vindicated: . . . And at that time, while I was greatly reproached for defending this Doctrine in the Pulpit, and just upon my suffering a very open Abuse for it, God's Work wonderfully brake forth amongst us, and souls began to flock to Christ, as the Saviour in whose Righteousness alone they hoped to be justified; So that this was the Doctrine on which this work in its Beginning was founded, as it evidently was in the whole progress of it." *Discourses on various Important Subjects, Nearly Concerning the Great Affair on the Soul's Eternal Salvation*. Boston: S. Kneeland and T. Green, 1733. p. ii.
28. As quoted in Wesley M. Gewehr, *The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1930. p. 16.
29. In *ibid.*, p. 65.
30. From Leonard J. Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition, A Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1944. pp. 90-91.
31. William Warren Sweet, *The American Churches, an Interpretation*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948. pp. 30-31.
32. See for example Winthrop S. Hudson's review of Sweet's *The American Churches*, in *The Crozer Quarterly*, XXV (Oct. 1948), pp. 358-60.
33. See Isaac Backus, *A History of New England, with Particular Reference to the Denomination of Christians called Baptists*. 2d ed., with notes by David Weston. Newton, Mass.: The Backus Historical Society, 1871. II, 41.
34. *Adventures of Ideas*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933. pp. 27-28.
35. John Wesley, *Sermons on Several Occasions*. New York: Lane and Scott, 1851. I, 392.
36. Quoted in Sweet, *The American Churches*, pp. 46-47.
37. Quoted in Gewehr, *The Great Awakening in Virginia*, p. 65.
38. See in this connection my article, "American Protestantism During the Revolutionary Epoch," *Church History*, XXII (Dec. 1953), 279-297; Wilhelm Pauk, "Theology in the Life of Contemporary American Protestantism," *The Shane Quarterly*, XIII (April, 1952), 37-50; J. L. Diman, "Religion in America, 1776-1876," *North American Review*, CXXII (Jan. 1876).
39. From the Autobiography, in Frank Luther Mott and Chester E. Jorgenson, *Benjamin Franklin, Representative Selections. . .*, New York: American Book Company, 1936. p. 70.
40. Saul K. Padover (ed.), *The Complete Jefferson*. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearee, Inc., 1943. p. 676.
41. James Madison, "A Memorial and Remonstrance on the Religious Rights of Man," as printed in Joseph L. Blau (ed.), *Cornerstones of Religious Freedom in America*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1949. p. 81.
42. Padover (ed.), *The Complete Jefferson*, p. 676.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 675.
44. As quoted in Henry Wilder Foote, *Thomas Jefferson: Champion of Religious Freedom, Advocate of Christian Morals*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1947. p. 52.
45. Joseph Priestley, *An History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, Birmingham: J. Thompson, 1793.
46. See Ralph Barton Perry, *Puritanism and Democracy*. New York: The Vanguard Press, p. 80.
47. In a previous article in this Journal (December 1954) I discussed the nature of the denominational organization and the almost complete triumph of denominationalism during the first half of the nineteenth century.

## HIRSCH'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY

### A REVIEW ARTICLE

By G. WAYNE GLICK, *Franklin and Marshall College*

*Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie in Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens*, Vols. III, IV, and V. By EMANUEL HIRSCH. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1951, 1952, 1954. 397 pages, 612 pages, 664 pages. With Name, Topic, and Scriptural Indices.

Emanuel Hirsch stands in the great tradition of Harnack and Troeltsch, representing with an unabated enthusiasm the cause of liberal theology, and pursuing with a like competence the historical studies of his interest. To be sure, he represents a theological position which is at present under a cloud, and no one is more aware of this than he himself. This fact does not greatly trouble him, for he knows history too well to be overly concerned with those exigencies which make one theology popular and another suspect at any given period. In the presentation of the five masterly volumes interpreting the "modern evangelical theology" from the Peace of Westphalia to the Franco-Prussian War, he demonstrates a complete familiarity with the history of theology and its cultural setting. The dated position which he holds, plus the fact that collusion with the Nazis has besmirched his name, has resulted in considerable pointed invective, perhaps to the degree that his monumental scholarly labor has been unjustly evaluated. The work before us is, by any standard, of such "monumental" proportions. When one compares it, with its comprehensive treatment of the original writings, with the dainty tidbits which issue from time to time from the American press, the result is hardly complimentary to American scholarship. This reviewer found four instances in the entire five volumes where Hirsch falls back on secondary material. Even here, he apologizes profusely because the war (during which the work was written) made it impossible for him to gain access to original sources.

Hirsch's politics may deserve all the invective they have evoked; but his competence as a historian cannot be impugned.

The three volumes here under review comprise the second *Zeitraum* in the scheme of division adopted by Hirsch, extending from the middle of the eighteenth to the second third of the nineteenth century. There are six books, made up of thirty chapters, into which the material is divided, and it is to be expected that the largest number of chapters should be given over to the German theological and cultural development. Nineteen of the chapters deal with Germany, while England and France are treated in four chapters each, and America and Denmark in one each. It is obvious, for example in the chapter on American theology, that the criterion for selection is that of uniqueness of contribution rather than breadth of influence. Jonathan Edwards rates a mere two pages, while Ralph Waldo Emerson is given three times that much, or one-fifth of the total chapter. This criterion is obviously operative throughout the work, with the possible exception of the German theology. Here, Hirsch apparently finds everyone, from Urlsperger to Kant, unique. To cavil with a German on this point, however, is to waste breath: *medio tutissimus ibus* is hardly a Germanic canon where German scholarship is concerned.

Volume III begins with an interpretative chapter covering the total *Zeitraum*. Heretofore, the *geistigen* leadership of the nations had rested with the Church. True, Leibniz had already marked a decisive turning-point in the history of German evangelical theology by making reason the norm for resolving contradictions between revelation and natural reason. However, emergent Pietism had been far too strong to require immediate concession. Even in 1740 a perceptive observer could hardly have predicted

that there would be so radical a break in the leadership of thought as occurred. This break, adumbrated and evidenced in the poets, was grounded in reason and education. It involved a thinking through of the total relationship between state and society, independent of theological and ecclesiastical views. Among the ecclesiastics, the radical *Schwärmer* alone upheld that combination of religious earnestness and radical interrogation which was later to mark the genius of the nineteenth century giants. This sense of freedom and emancipation, with its attempt to "understand humanity," touched all areas of human endeavor, but was particularly bound to science, art, and literature. This was true equally in Germany, on the one hand, and in France and England on the other; but the process by which this "sense of free humanity" developed was different. In France and England, all metaphysical-religious attempts were abjured, and the effort to interpret man *sub specie temporalis* predominated. The issue of this attempt was seen in the French Revolution. For even though the Revolution gave way to Restoration, the basis on which power groups had previously operated had vanished. In Germany, by contrast, there was a valiant attempt to harmonize reason and revelation, to actualize a "Christian *Aufklärung*" in which state, science, and Church might happily cohabit under the aegis of reason. However, under the impact of the hard questions of the poets and philosophers — Lessing, Goethe, Herder, Kant, Fichte—it didn't come off. The breakthrough of the idealistic-romantic spirit in the fourth decade of the nineteenth century betokened the destruction of the self-evident Christian basis of human existence.

Three motifs, therefore, are to be seen as dominant in the century following 1740. Under the impact of the scientific contemplation of the world, the self-evident support of God and the good, freedom and immortality, was shattered. Through the new disciplines of biology, psychology, and history, man himself became an object for study alongside other objects. Fi-

nally, theology, working from a different anthropology and cosmology than that afforded by the new learning, found it imperative to examine and recast its subject matter. It is of prime importance to note that this development grew out of necessity, not unfaith. With a few exceptions, the men who carried through this reformation were completely serious in their engagement of the problem.

Hirsch believes that the great advance of European culture since 1740 is in large part the monument to those men who, because of the nature of the givens of this time, had to be other than theologians. This is, without apology, a *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie in Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens*. The critiques which have appeared on the continent, scoring Hirsch at this point, would find a double rejoinder from the Göttinger. These were men of their time, and the great problem which the time bequeathed to them was that of a radical challenge to all revelational systems in the name of reason. They tried to deal with it. Furthermore, every true theologian today must live through these wars in his own thinking and living, attempting to understand his own history in the light of this received heritage.

Book V of the total work traces western European thought to the time of the French Revolution. In England, the fifty years preceding the French Revolution were marked by a bovine contentment within the Church. The threat of Deism was believed to have been met by Bishop Butler, and churchmen generally held the conviction that Newtonian science and Cudworthian philosophy could mate happily and work efficiently in the theological enterprise. Among the "higher classes," however, there was considerable cynicism vis-a-vis the Church. One group, depending on the materialism of Hobbes and claiming Locke as his interpreter, became radically critical of the Church. Another group, by far the most influential on the continent in this period, operated on the basis of a psychological-empirical an-

alysis of human nature. This latter group, composed of men like Hartley, Priestly, and Hume, either overtly spurned Christianity, or identified it with certain humane, this-worldly, ethical concepts. Hartley and Priestly followed the latter course, in somewhat diverse ways. Hume, "the clearest English thinker and free-spirit of the eighteenth century," destroyed the religion of reason and natural religion. Though he was not the first to attack miracles, he refused, as had previously been the case, to exempt the Bible; and with his criticism of miracles "fate raps at the door of Christianity." Fateful as was this critique, it was hardly less fraught with significance than Hume's theory on the origin of ethical judgments; for through Adam Smith, Hume's greatest pupil, the theory of the moral sentiments was explicated and applied to an interpretation of economics. Smith's "economic egoism," upon which his *Wealth of Nations* was built, has been equally pregnant with emancipating and demonic possibilities.

Meanwhile, in France, the influence of Louis XIV lived on through the enforced unity of Church and culture, achieved in cooperation with the Jesuits. This malignant influence, with its book burnings, censorship, and other repressive measures, continued until the Revolution. In spite of this the noble earnestness of the Huguenots, the Jansenists, and the Quietists made itself felt; and even Voltaire was freely read in Paris via smuggled copies. Calvin's prophecy that France would reap the judgment of God was fulfilled in the post-Louis period: through Louis, Church and *Unglaube* triumphed in France. The instrument of the former was the Jesuits, of the latter, Voltaire. As the bearer of the Enlightenment to France, Voltaire, from his sanctuary at Ferney, attacked religion indiscriminately from the standpoint of his anti-Christian Deism. Basically Voltaire was a dilettante. His power lay in his popularization of certain elements of the previous English thought, especially the Lockian dictum that sensory perception is the basis of all knowledge. God was

not, according to Voltaire, the "barbaric, malignant" deity of Christian faith, but a weak and therefore forgivable deity. By this *tour de force*, Voltaire simply substituted Fate for God and left the problem confused. Nor was the contribution which he made to historical thought more salutary. In reality, he had no appreciation for events, except as they contribute to the flowering of art and science, which are really important. The biblical perspective of the centrality of event was scornfully rejected; Voltaire found the scandal of particularity just too scandalous, and cast his ballot for Posterity and Progress.

The Enlightenment in France evidenced itself in a three-fold way. Holbach and de la Mettrie interpreted everything in terms of matter, denied the God-concept and the distinction of natural and revealed religion, and preached a mechanistic necessity in nature. Buffon and Robinet took the position of a pantheistic vitalism, holding that God is "quelque chose," but of him they affirmed only that he is "nicht Nichts." Condillac and d'Alembert, as sensualist positivists, abjured all metaphysic and theology and held that things are known only in their sensual representation. For Hirsch, the three options here presented are still the live options for those who orient themselves primarily to nature and science: either atheism on a materialist basis, pantheism on a naturalistic basis, or the scientific abnegation of thought about God on a positivistic basis.

Ethical discussion in France, of the sort represented by Helvetius, was largely borrowed from England, and was highly suspect to the Church. Political and social theory, as worked out by Montesquieu and Quesnay, also ran afoul of the ecclesiastical authorities. In fact, French Enlightenment bore a single integrating theme, fraught with calamitous implications: the Roman Catholic Church was unalterably opposed to the developing scientific *Weltanschauung*, committed itself to a social and political pattern that was doomed, and engaged in a futile struggle to protect "religious" faith from

any attempted relational synthesis with scientific cosmology.

The remainder of Book V is given over to a discussion of the career and significance of Jean Jacques Rousseau. Of all western thinkers, Hirsch holds Rousseau as the greatest influence on German thought: "everything in Germany from Lessing to Fichte was built on him." Like Rousseau, German thinkers rejected the skepticism and the atheism of the Illuminists in France; from him they derived that gospel of freedom and individuality which was so gloriously worked out in the nineteenth century. This was triumphant Pelagianism, and Rousseau, turning away from a century in which the shallow effusions of Voltaire could be called great, yet completed this century in himself. For he believed, with his century, in the doctrine of progress, though he could not believe that progress brings happiness. There are two motifs by which he sought to challenge the "self-evident" proposition that fulfillment of humanity brings happiness. One was his individualism, the discovery of *sich selber*, the priceless realization "dass er ist, und nicht nicht ist." The other motif was his critique of society, as the perverting influence on man. The significance of Rousseau's individualism was that it made the thought and feeling of the individual the final ethical and religious measure. Man was not freed from the ethical and religious demand, but this demand was located in "living men" rather than book-norms or dogma. Thus, Rousseau could appeal to the picture of Jesus which he discovered in the Gospels, *sans* dogma, as a grand and noble pattern: "Take the miracles out of the Gospels, and all the world will lie at the feet of Jesus." Such an appeal made Rousseau the *Bahnbrecher* of that new Protestantism which eviscerated all doctrinal considerations from the Gospel and held up in its stead the pure piety and ethics of Jesus. Through his basing of ethics on feeling—on a good heart—Rousseau revealed a fatal weakness; but at least he challenged the too-simple relationship which the Christian theologians

had established vis-a-vis the new thought.

Book VI deals with the period of the Revolution and Restoration in non-German thought. An introductory chapter discusses the religious and historical consequences of the French Revolution. Hirsch mentions the obvious effects—the awakening of a sense of French national unity, and the constriction of advantage previously enjoyed by the Catholics. He then passes on to that which was the "novelty" of this historical phenomenon. In a word, this was Democracy, the belief that the highest referent of political and social order lies in the freedom and worth of the individual. Without this belief, the technical and social development of the nineteenth century had not been possible; but the democratic concept of freedom was not as non-authoritarian as many believed. For though man's existence was no longer seen as bound to a higher divine power, the state, built by man's own thought, became the guarantor of freedom. With the formation of parties and the conflict thereby aroused, there was not more freedom, but less. These developments touched the life of man in its very depths, and presented to the theologians of the nineteenth century a monumental task. To mention a single facet, the revolutionary view of man altered the concept of *vocatio* from that of a station given by God for the service of God and man to that of man serving his own ends.

In the revolutionary epoch itself, the central meaning is to be seen in the Napoleonic Concordats of 1801 and 1802. Napoleon, himself a child of the Revolution, was willing to give to the Pope a religious and political significance which had been denied him by all Enlightenment and Revolution figures. Viewing the Church question solely from the standpoint of the state, however, he made the Pope his tool and brought on a mortal struggle. The more important long range effects were the splitting of the Roman Catholic Church in France, and the discovery that as between the old Europe and the new, Roman Catholicism stood with the old. It was Lammenais



through whom this denouement became apparent. He symbolized the new Europe in that he held his conscience inviolate as against the required papal obedience, and, in his attempt to be a "liberal Catholic," was inevitably frustrated. It was not until the World War that the themes which were introduced by the Revolution were played through. The background was the process of development of the themes of freedom and democracy, joined to the industrial and technical potential of the nineteenth century. Against this background political Catholicism ("anti-democratic Christian democracy") developed: in the Catholic parties of France, Ireland, Belgium, and Germany, in the involvement in power politics, culminating in the Vatican Council, and in the emergence in France of a chaotic institution at the end of the battle.

The Restoration must be regarded as a negative movement, originating in wounded interest. Yet, through *Schlagwort* artists like Burke, and more substantial intellectuals like Haller and de Maistre, Restoration thought exerted a powerful influence on religion, and particularly on evangelical theology. The basal purpose of Haller's *Restauration der Staatswissenschaft* was to overthrow the Enlightenment. Arguing that the right of power comes from God, he favored such slogans as "Throne and Altar" as identifying the temporal bearers of this power. In Chateaubriand, influenced by Rousseau and in his turn influencing the art and poetry of the nineteenth century, there was a masterly use of the sentimental romantic approach. Arguing, like Novalis, with one eye on the "golden" middle ages, he extolled the bequests of beauty and honor which Christianity had given to the world. De Maistre went further, in the influential *Du Pape*, declaring that God, to implement his purpose of joy and justice, has made known his will and designated his power to the Pope. Without obedience to the Pope, the "Protestant nihilism" which underlies the Enlightenment and the Revolution cannot be checked. A basic philosophy of authority was thus

explicated. The great influence which de Maistre exerted upon younger Catholics justifies the judgment that the doctrine of papal infallibility was a fruit of Restoration Catholicism. The young Lammenais could argue, in his ultramontane period, that the reasonable basis required for life must come through the higher reason which is to be found in the Pope, who joins together in himself the authority of common human reason and the authority of revelation. Lammenais' later disenchantment was paradigmatic, however; for as the lines drew more tightly, it became evident that the "liberté" in *L'Avenir's* masthead meant something far different than the freedom which de Maistre declared. The great literary movement of the future France declined de Maistre's gambit, and departed from the Church.

Before evaluating the theological development taking place in western Europe and America, Hirsch discusses the beginnings of agnosticism, positivism, and socialism. It is not debatable that this movement of thought is dominant in our own era, nor that it is alien to Christianity. Hirsch points out what Wundt had long observed before, that socialism is incipient in the "new enlightenment" of Bentham. Bentham's thought was characterized by a continued confidence in the "sound reason" of man to order the law of the state and community so that the greatest happiness may accrue to the greatest number. John Stuart Mill, arguing that *Geisteswissenschaft* is to be considered a science and studied, as all others, on the basis of nature, can be taken as a paradigm of nineteenth century science and techniques. Ethics becomes social science, and the insistence on a non-metaphysical, humanly-oriented approach means that religious questions have no place in a scientific consideration of society. This agnostic positivism became increasingly the presuppositional stance of the influential thinkers of Europe after 1830. Saint-Simon, earlier, had seen the technical possibilities of the new scientific discoveries for the development of a better society. Merging the ideas of evolution and of scientific



planning, he dreamed of a unified society, actualizing the ideal of brotherly love in community; but this actualization was to be achieved by the human reason with the help of positive science. This relating of the Christian love-ethic to the ordering of society according to a socialistic pattern became, through Saint-Simon's preaching of this "new Christianity," one of the most important features of the nineteenth century. But Hirsch strongly demurs: you will not get "brother-love" from a scientifically planned society, and furthermore, the anthropological assumptions of this "new Christianity" were most dubious.

With Auguste Comte, positivism assumed its most explicit form. Influenced by Rousseau (man exists in a *fatalité modifiable*), he deviated from him in his explication of Turgot's "law of three stages" and emerged with a full-blown doctrine of progress. The deepest questions were "scuttled or buried under a layer of asphalt," as when, in considering religion, he viewed it entirely from the standpoint of external rites and dogmas. Seen thus, religion emerged as "the sum total of the commonly held superstitions of a past time," an interpretation which was instilled into the workers and citizens with no little success.

Socialism emerged in France and England, the first countries to experience the Industrial Revolution. In France, theoretical socialism, as seen in Fourier, built on the utilitarian-positivistic - evolutionary foundations already laid, and communistic experiments were advocated by Louis Blanc and Cabet. In England, socialism took the meliorated form of a political radicalism, as in Owen, the Trade Union Movement, and the Chartist Movement. And in 1847 there was a treatise called *The Communist Manifesto*, explicating an economic materialism and paying scant notice to the dated bourgeois concepts of morals and religion.

Darwin was epochal, not only because of the influence of his work on *natural* science, but almost more because of his influence on *historical* science. Only Kierkegaard, unheard in

Denmark, was aware of the change in history which was adumbrated in the first half of the century, as the great positivistic works on folk-psychology, history of religion, and culture-history began to appear. The majority of the churchmen and theologians of the first half of the century were either trying to go back to a pre-Enlightenment Eden (*pace* Hengstenberg), or to out-adjust the acculturated (*pace* the *Redden* Schleiermacher).

The remainder of Volume III, which also completes Book VI, is composed of three chapters on English and American theological development. Hirsch's evaluation of the English positions of the nineteenth century is consummately drawn and studded with penetrating insights. The Evangelical movement in the Church of England must be seen against the background of William Paley and the point of view represented in the *Evidences*. . . . Though Wesley, like the Pietists who had influenced him so deeply, meant to stay in the Church, a group "through its zeal" broke off and augmented English Dissent. Those who remained in the Church became the Evangelical party, and in the first third of the nineteenth century wielded great influence. Hirsch's discussion of Newton, Venn, Milner, Wilberforce, Thornton, Simeon, and Hannah More indicates his conviction that, in spite of their opposition to the prevailing complacency within the Church of England, they were influenced far more by Paley and his "God wills the happiness of his creation" than they would have admitted. The implementation differs; but in the attempt on the part of the Evangelicals to combine the service of the Gospel and the war for human happiness, the goal was essentially the same as that extolled by Paley. The Evangelicals did insist, however, on the Bible as the infallible basis of all faith and doctrine.

In Scotland, the evangelical movement had been foreshadowed by the small free-Church movements of 1733 and 1752. After William MacGill's break with the old satisfaction theory in 1786, Scotland was ripe for evangelicalism. Though the Haldane broth-

ers, influenced by English evangelicalism, laid the foundations, the organizer and leader of the party was Thomas Chalmers. Rejecting Paley and Butler, Chalmers constructed a theology which in many ways paralleled that of his American contemporary, Lyman Beecher. In this theology there was a union of the Puritan will to undergird the entire populace with godly order and the modern thrust toward freedom and understanding. Through the Church all society will be influenced by Christian faith; only in this way can a sound basis for community be established. But here lies the weakness of Chalmers' position: for the simple preaching of the Gospel, which in turn creates a strong inner character, does not necessarily relate itself to that which is not within the Church. Yet Chalmers' greatness was that he juxtaposed ethical thought from the world of culture and his pure preaching of the Gospel. Contemporary American thought, of the sort exemplified in Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture*, could profitably study this development. Hirsch discovers a "law of the nineteenth century" in the denouement which results from the increasing pressure of the evangelicals on the state: "the revival movement is not capable of building from the entire people a unified form of the Church, and must therefore become one element beside others in a larger *Landeskirche*: either this, or fragment into many groups."

Hirsch next discusses the work of Vinet and the founding of the Free Church of Vaud in 1845. For Vinet, with his insistence that conscience is the central point of man's personality, and the essence of religion therefore the relation of an individual to God, it became increasingly necessary that there be a separation of Church and state. For the state and society can order only those things which pertain to reason and nature; they cannot order conscience. Vinet's importance, somewhat qualified by his determined fight against socialism in the name of his individualism, lay in two contributions. Unlike the English and Americans who worked from Locke in their

argument for the separation of Church and state, he explicated his views from within a specifically Christian and churchly orientation. Secondly, he made it possible for western European Protestantism, which could expect only bad from the Restoration powers, to regard the ideas of 1789 as Christian and churchly in their essential form.

In the post-Napoleonic generation in England, liberalism was making increasing headway, as witness the repeal of the Test Act, and the accomplishing of Catholic Emancipation. It was out of the anxiety which this emerging liberalism evoked that the Oxford Movement arose. "For the first time in the history of Anglicanism there was some enthusiasm" when Keble the poet presented his program for Anglican theology. By the aesthetic utilization of cultus, subjectivity, the bearer of faith and love, was enclosed within churchly objectivity. Keble's concerns were passed on through Froude to Newman, with Pusey emphasizing the real presence in the sacraments as the very center of the required renewal. Hirsch holds that all of these men, as a result of their evangelical education, were motivated by an intense concern for holiness, united with the need for an objective religious reality. In flight to the Church alone could they find these concerns met. Another strain common to all of the Noetics, and of great importance for neo-Anglicanism, was "their complete indifference to the question of truth"; their need for certainty preceded and overrode this question. As the *Tracts for the Times* appeared, it became increasingly evident that a crisis was shaping; in Tract 10, the priesthood of all believers was barely tolerated, in Tracts 38 and 41 (where the *via media* concept is developed) the authority of the Church over the individual was asserted, and in Tract 85 the Church was declared to equal Scripture in authority. Tract 90 brought the full crisis, of course, with everything conceded to Rome except papalism and the transsubstantiation dogma. Four years after this, during which time Newman had developed his thought on the doctrine of justifi-

cation in a way which "shows love for Rome, little for Luther," and turned the doctrine into a "justification by faith, love and obedience," Newman took the step to Rome. Thus he proved *via media* to be an illusion. He also made necessary for himself, holding as he did to Rome's primitiveness and catholicity and yet seeing her novelties, the construction of a theory to account for these novelties. His *Theory of Development* of 1845 was the result.

The Broad Church Movement, which was not a movement at all, was influenced by that turn of the century liberalism which "had a conscious sense of historical multiformity, and of religion, and therefore felt the necessity for a 'broad' view." There were a number of early contributors to the Broad Church position, with wide-ranging interests. Richard Whately wrote an attack on Hume. Arnold, writing against the Noetics, held that unity of organization need not destroy distinction in confession, doctrine, and worship. Hampden became a favorite target of the Oxford Movement by insisting on the distinction between theology and philosophy. Hare had the warmest appreciation of Luther of any nineteenth century Englishman, and expressed it in his *Vindication*. . . of 1855, thereby influencing Maurice. Carlyle opposed the materialism and skepticism of science as the strongest betrayal of human life, and preached the Fichtean doctrine in his "eternal *ja*" of faith. The three great theologians of the Broad Church Movement were F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and F. W. Robertson, though no one of them was a "scientific theologian" in the German sense. The importance of Maurice lay in his attempt to join the best psychological-humanistic insights with a freely-conceived High Church position; he was the "father of English churchly attempts to justify ethical concern and activity from the standpoint of the Church." Kingsley, strongly influenced by Maurice, based his passionate Protestantism and his work in the Chartist Movement on two convictions: that all nature is filled with God's wonder

and power, human history demonstrating the victory of good over evil, and that all men are potential instruments of Christ's work, and are to be brought under his sovereignty. Robertson's importance, never adequately recognized in England, and seldom in Germany, rested on his unique teaching with regard to the inspiration of the Scripture. He opposed the "bibliolatry" of the Evangelicals, and held that it was no better than Romanism. There is a human-historical meaning to the Scripture, but true revelation consists in the enlightening of *lives* in terms of truth, beauty, and love. One must look deeper than dogma to appropriate Christ's life and death, for, as the "Son of Man," he is the Platonic "form" of man. This "form" is love, the very essence of Godhead. Hirsch is obviously deeply impressed by Robertson's *Aussöhnung* doctrine, regarding it as the crown of his theology.

There was little immediate influence from the Broad Church theologians, however, on the Church of England; what was to become important was the incipient concern with historical-exegetical problems. In this regard, the last half of the nineteenth century witnessed a running warfare between the Evangelicals and the High-Church group. This was marked by *l'affaire Colenso*, indicating that there was no place as yet for historical criticism, Farrar's woes, and the significant but quiet work of Westcott, Hort, and Lightfoot. There was no victory in the war until Gore presented his *Lux Mundi* solution in 1889. By a propositional theologoumenon ("As the God-Man had a divine and a human nature, so does the Bible"), he made possible the critical examination of the Bible. Thus the freedom of historical and philological research for which the *Essays and Reviews* of 1860 had fought was achieved, albeit *cum sensu prorsus alieno*, and a new era in the history of Anglican theology was opened.

Volume III concludes with a chapter on American theology to the Civil War, and Hirsch should rate some commendation for his un-German act

in at least recognizing the existence of "the wise people." This reviewer confesses an ambivalent reaction to this chapter: on the one hand, it shows a remarkable awareness of the forces that shaped American thought; on the other, as has already been suggested, Hirsch seems to be over-impressed with the bizarre. Thus, in the first instance, he discusses the influence of the frontier, of immigration, the situation under a system of separation of Church and state, and the development of the system of voluntarism, all with a competence that indicates a more than casual acquaintance with American history. Having passed over the eighteenth century with an unseemly haste, however, he is intrigued with the nineteenth century Adventists, Mormons, and Spiritualists to the point that he can generalize that "North American theology can be portrayed as an evangelical orthodoxy based on a crass biblicism." Hirsch sees the American dilemma clearly, yet with amazement: at the same time that liberty was being fought for, slavery was accepted as the pattern. There is grim irony in the comment of the erstwhile Nazi sympathizer that the meaning of the Civil War is to be seen in the identification of political freedom with the freedom of God, and the equating of the Kingdom of God with an ethico-religious form. Therefore, in America, to work for the Kingdom of God came to mean work for the betterment of the human community, and this interpretation has been "burned into the American *Zeitgeist*."

Hirsch proceeds to discuss Taylor, Bushnell, Schaff, and the emerging biblical criticism in three pages, and the transcendentalism of Ralph Waldo Emerson in seven! The inclination to chide Hirsch at this point is somewhat dissipated as one examines the evaluation of Emerson. Hirsch declares that the "optimistic play of God and the spirit" which Emerson found to be the relation between natural reality and reasoning will has less Christianity in it than the thought of Kant and the German idealists or Carlyle and Coleridge. Emerson's signifi-

cance lay in the fact that for the first time in America, someone was speaking from a standpoint which was clearly outside the Church. There is to be no separation between trust in God and trust in the self; and the Alpha and Omega of Emerson's religion is to be seen in this self-development of the human personality from its essential divine ground. Emerson is the first clear sign that "American Christianity needed further work in order to establish it on a sound religious footing," and the wise people did not deal with this further need until there was a cross-fertilization with "the older Christianity." This reviewer finds Hirsch's insights extremely relevant to the contemporary situation where the modern "cults of adjustment" perpetuate the optimistic trust-in-God trust-in-self confusion. However, he is not as convinced as Hirsch seems to be that the fertilization process has borne sufficient fruit to check the blatant cultists who individually babble their formulas for "self-realization." Certainly there is a suggestive direction of investigation here for some student of nineteenth century American thought who wishes to help us understand the peeling voices of the twentieth century cults.

Volume IV begins Book VII of the total work, in which Hirsch returns to a consideration of German thought. The last two large volumes are given over to German thinkers, with the exception of Kierkegaard and several minor personages. Book VII deals with the German Christian Enlightenment in the Semler-Lessing era, and is initiated with a discussion of the German neologists exclusive of Semler. The situation in 1740 in Germany was one of eager expectancy. The Wolffian philosophy had been developed, the deistic and anti-deistic literature from England had been accepted and assimilated, German Lutheranism, albeit influenced by Pietism, provided the perennial theological questions, and, God be praised, an enlightened king was on the throne, without whom "the entire spiritual and religious development of Germany would be unthinkable." The great questions to be

dealt with were the relation of reason and revelation and the problem of the Scriptures. These questions had to be considered from a standpoint within the Church. The neologists knew themselves to be bound to the orders and laws of the Church, and therefore cast their thought in churchly forms. At the same time, they held to that basic Protestant, German, Lutheran freedom which increasingly demanded of them a historico-grammatical exegesis of the Scriptures and a thorough study of comparative historical doctrine.

That there may have been certain schizoid tendencies operating among the neologists is hinted at in the work of Ernesti. He insisted that there must be a disjunction of the philological-historical and the theological roles of the exegete; the authority and the interest of the Church must never be considered in the first instance. Ernesti's successor Morus went further to abjure every sacramental-hierarchical view of *Amt* and *Kirche* as it related to hermeneutics. J. J. Spalding, the outstanding neologist who concerned himself with doctrine, had "read the field" of deistic and anti-deistic writing, and emphasized that "when the light of the Gospel has enlightened the spirit" natural religion will be best known and taught. That which is important in preaching is the betterment of men; the teaching of Jesus, put in simple everyday language, should take precedence over the explication of scriptural doctrine. What lay behind this emphasis on Jesus as exemplar was a radical break with the Augustinian doctrine of original sin and the Fall. Spalding found such doctrines ethically indefensible as related to God and ethically impotent for men. With Tollner, likewise, the teaching of Jesus was the essential concept, and was so presented as to stand over against the belief in the inspiration of the Bible. As to revelation, God can be known in his reality through the natural reason, and what the reason cannot give, viz., certainty of immortality, is supplied by the words of Jesus the exemplar.

J. S. Semler, the greatest of the

neologists, must today be judged as the turning-point from the Old Protestant to the modern Protestant theology. The first man to use *liberaliter* as referring to theology, he was motivated by a passionate desire to make Christianity the safe and certain basis of the nation, and to do this, chose reason as his instrument. Revealed theology he rejected as impossible, and held that revelation, to be meaningful, must meet three qualifications. It must have a moral relation to the receiver. It must sustain some connection to the natural human reason. And it can carry conviction only if it is given to men who possess a definite ethico-religious consciousness. But the biblical writings clearly present a problem here; for there is no moral content in much of the Old Testament, and little in parts of the New. In the teaching of Jesus, however, this content is pre-eminently present, a content which grasps men and is, therefore, the Word of God. With this shift from the old evangelical doctrine of the inner witness of the Holy Spirit, the view of the Bible as the inspired Word of God was lost. Henceforth the possibility of taking sentences from the Bible as the basis of dogma, in the belief that all of the Bible is God's Word, has disappeared.

The chief significance of Semler's work lies in the fact that he was the first German theologian who attempted to see the Bible from the standpoint of a critical and yet religious historian. Adumbrating many of the themes which Harnack was later to develop, he insisted a) that the Scripture must be historically understood, b) that the Old Testament must be read in terms of the norm enunciated in the New, and c) that the New Testament itself gives only an initial form of Christian doctrine, locked in Jewish and oriental thought-forms and speech. Christianity had as its main problem the emancipation of itself from this initial form. "He who, as a Christian, would correctly use the New Testament, must distinguish the method of teaching (*Lehrart*) from the essential contents (*Sachinhalt*)."



was Semler, also, who inserted into German thought the concept of *Entwicklung*, employed so fruitfully by Lessing, Kant, Fichte, and pre-eminently, Hegel. Those who chide him for his rationalism should also remember that it was Semler who introduced an important methodological principle in insisting that a man of the past be allowed to speak for himself. For example, in the Augustinian-Pelagian controversy, Semler let Pelagius and his friends say for themselves what they had to say, without taking Augustine's statement of Pelagius' position as definitive.

Hirsch concludes with qualified encomium. Though Semler finished no subject, he left a large number of questions of real importance for later theologians and scholars: in the realm of biblical exegesis, the relation of Judaism to Christianity, the relation of personal to ecclesiastical religion, the relation of Christian truth and theological knowledge, and the problem of the historical conditionedness of Christianity. It was Schleiermacher who was the real heir, who worked through to a consistent theology what Semler left unfinished; and had there been no Semler, Schleiermacher could not have done what he did.

The neologists' concern to utilize the emerging historical point of view in an examination of Scripture, dogma, and ecclesiastical development did not go unchallenged. Hirsch takes a chapter to discuss the strife within which the neologists were engaged, as they related themselves more and more closely to the rationalists, however unhappily. Semler could not quite bear the radical threats to the old system which the very method he had espoused made possible and imperative for his students. Therefore he opposed Müller in the "Devil-War" of the sixties and Reimarus' views in the *Fragmente* of the seventies; but Pandora's box was open. Seiler of Erlangen, Storr, Flatt, Döderlein, Carpzov, Goeze, and others of similar ilk battled with Teller, Gruner, Ursperger, Jerusalem, Büsching, Eberhard, *et al.* Meanwhile the pastors,

as students of Semler, Ernesti, Michaelis, and Spalding, investigated, compared doctrines, read non-theological literature—and turned against the old views. By 1780, the crisis was at hand: "The old evangelical view of Church and theology is dead, and the Christianity of the young resembles that 'useful rationalism' which emphasizes Jesus and his teaching."

But this was true of those within the Church; there were multiform movements without, to which more and more "pastors' sons" were drawn. Literature and philosophy were seeking autonomy, no longer regarding old orthodoxy as worthy of combat. In the literary endeavors of Klopstock and Wieland one can mark the profound change in German spiritual life; and with Nicolai, Mendelssohn, Bahrdt, and Basedow, the *Aufklärung* was at hand, urging the medicine of reason for all ills. There must be freedom to prove everything by reason, freedom for reason as it works against magical and demonic elements in religion, freedom to identify that simple religion of Jesus which is wise, good, and—reasonable! Finally, there must be freedom to separate this simple religion of Jesus from the impure accretions which were admixed into the Gospels. The history of the Christian Church, with its hodge-podge of doctrine, must be investigated, that it may be freed. This is possible, for Protestantism rests on a sound basis in insisting on the validity of conscience as against authority. The question, then, over which the full theological enlightenment was to break out, was this: Could there be a synthesis of the "religion of Jesus" and the rationalism of the neologists? But before considering "the creative breakthrough," several other factors which were in the Geist and which contributed to the breakthrough are discussed by Hirsch.

One range of factors can be seen by turning to Lessing and the controversy which resulted from his publication of the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*. Lessing was no friend of either the orthodox or the neologists, but admired the former more than the



latter. Whereas the orthodox buried Christianity, they yet had a certain honor about them; while the neologists, in attempting to join Christianity and reason, shamed both: "They try to make us reasonable Christians, and make us unreasonable philosophers." Like Voltaire, Lessing was instrumental in shattering the old Christianity; but while Voltaire was a sensualist and skeptic, Lessing was an idealist and did what he did out of a pure motive, anchored to conscience. Lessing's religion—all of it—was to be found in the *Humanitäts-ideal*, the eternal coming to completeness of which eternal life consists. History is in the last analysis the story of the development of this ethical-religious consciousness. Lessing could emphasize on this basis the necessity for the study of historical questions concerning the origin of the Gospels and the life of Jesus. His main purpose, however, as an "impartial observer", was to combat the old "bibliolatrie"—his word—and to complete the work of emancipation begun by the Reformers. In his publication from 1774-1778 of seven of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments of Reimarus, he secured an indelible place in the history of the new evangelical theology, contributing more to the outburst of critical doubt in Germany than anyone who had preceded him. Reimarus broke through, once and for all, the strictly dogmatic handling of the Gospel material, urging and making necessary an historical approach, and he set forth the main problem: Jesus' relation to Judaism, and the relation of the Easter-faith to Pentecost. Reinhard, in opposition to Lessing, made possible the acceptance of essential Christian doctrine by insisting on a "new Christocentrism." Jesus' life and mission became the object of investigation, but this new Christocentrism came into overt conflict with Lessing's dictum that historical truth must be excluded as the basis of religious certainty.

Another range of factors contributing to "the creative breakthrough" can be seen by directing attention to "the pious outsiders." These thinkers,

Oetinger, Hamann, Claudius, Lavater, and Hess, were not explicitly involved in the complex conflicts of the last half of the eighteenth century. They were, nonetheless, working with significance. Oetinger, influenced by Böhme, opposed the theological and philosophical enlightenment, and repeated many of the themes which Bengel had pressed. Hamann, holding to revelation as the source of all knowledge, regarded the Bible as the *telos* of revelation in nature and history. He even discovered orthodoxy in the mouth of the enemy Hume where the Scotsman declared, "The Christian religion was founded on miracles in the beginning, and cannot do without them now. Reason cannot convince us." Claudius, in some ways foreshadowing Schleiermacher, insisted that religion, which is grasped in faith, and reason, which deals with ideas and meanings, are entirely different things. Lavater, accepted by Germany as the greatest of the Swiss writers, was a subjectivist and relativist, avoiding theological system, and holding that true religion is a sort of God-created magic in the heart. Hess made an ineffectual attempt to relate the Messianic consciousness of Jesus to all the forms of history by means of an empirical-causal psychology, and in doing so became the initiator of the *Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Hirsch is particularly critical of Hamann for his denial of the possibility of relating Christ and culture, of Lavater for his substitution of the "magic of the heart" wherein "the Creator becomes the picture of the creation" for the power of Christian faith, and of Hess for his attempt to understand revelation as history. "The pious outsiders," indeed, attempt to stem the scientific-theological reflection of the *Aufklärung* by maintaining a concept of Christian truth which centers in its efficacy for moving the heart; but this was an attempt to go backward. Such an option had little chance of acceptance. There was only one direction possible, and Herder, Goethe, Kant, Schiller, Fichte, Schelling, Novalis, Hegel, and Schleiermacher, the leaders of "the creative breakthrough,"

dictated that this direction would be taken.

Book VIII of the total work, which deals with this "creative breakthrough," is comprised of six lengthy chapters on the thinkers just mentioned. The first chapter deals with Herder, "the clearest voice between Semler and Schleiermacher," and Goethe, the apostle of Eros. Herder adopted Lessing's concept of "humanity" as valid; but he went beyond him in emphasizing feeling, individuality, and religion as involved in the *Humanitätsideal*. Feeling is the very ground of humanity; individuality, more than the assertion of a rich subjectivity, involves the totality of the self; and religion "is the highest humanity: the essential blood of the human soul." God is the *Weltall*, active in the smallest creation, continuing his creation through the mediation of himself. Evil is simply incompleteness and weakness, serviceable to God by indicating what cannot be. Everything, therefore, is revelation, through which the godly education of humanity proceeds, and all revelation is to be seen in the developing history of humanity. As he dealt with the Bible, Herder affirmed that it contained godly truth which must and could be validated as against the confessions of the Church. However, in his acceptance of certain of the Deist criticisms of the proofs of Old Testament prophecy (Herder rejected all Jewish, Old Testament lineaments in his portrayal of Jesus), and his adopting of a historical relativism, he exposed the Bible to a more deadly criticism than that of the rationalists and the neologists. The Gospel for Herder is simply the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man: Jesus' message. Every vestige of the old evangelical doctrine of reconciliation disappears. On the preaching office, Herder's position shows remarkable similarity to that of Rousseau's *vicar of Savoy*, though he arrived at his view via history rather than by natural reason.

Hirsch's evaluation of the significance of Goethe is remarkable for the sharpness of its criticism. Unlike many German authors who feel compelled

to save the great libertine in spite of himself, Hirsch, admitting his influence in the German people, feels no compulsion to clean him up. Goethe made a clear decision to orient his life from a purely human standpoint, and the content of the Christian interpretation of life appeared to him more and more cramped and one-sided. He was in the final analysis a pantheistic determinist, a fatalist, one who could not accept the Christian scandal of particularity or a belief in the freedom of God. His influence on the theologians of his own generation was much less than that of Lessing. He did make possible, however, a re-interpretation of Eros as a quasi-religious symbol by substituting it for the mystery of reconciliation. Both in the heritage that shaped him, and in the influence which later emanated from him, Goethe represents the *Verhängnisvolle* of the German people.

Hirsch begins his treatment of Kant and Schiller with an admission of the difficulty of properly representing the great Königsberger. In his shattering of metaphysical certainty and his explication of a new theory of knowledge, Kant made it impossible that religion would again have a share in the scientific description of the world. In his insistence on the value of man as an end in himself and as an orderer of a nobler ethical community he exalted the fateful concept of autonomy which has occupied German thought to the present, presenting perennial difficulty to the evangelical community. His insistence on the primacy of the practical reason and his development of the concept of the postulate has had a wide and continuing influence on the history of theology. Like Herder, Kant rejected the doctrine of reconciliation, and held that man truly fulfils his humanity through a moral perfection. Jesus is the exalted moral teacher, and his saving and reconciling activity inheres in his exemplar-role. The historical in Christian faith cannot be taken as essential, however, for the essence lies in the universal will to good which is the moral law. Kant's lack of interest in historical criticism attaches here, for the

moral value of the Bible remains what it is; it will not be raised or depreciated by the achieving of answers to critical problems.

Schiller is to be seen as joining the Kantian philosophy with the aestheticism of Herder and Goethe. He was no Christian, clear enough; but his historical dramas, in which the aesthetic and the ethical are brought into mutual relation, exerted a remarkable influence in Hegel and von Ranke. Further, the real question is whether Schiller's *Humanität* and *Lebensdeutung* can provide a fruitful basis for the penetration of Christian faith; and this, Hirsch holds, has been affirmatively proved often enough.

Though J. G. Fichte was a pious man, his view of revelation, his doctrine of the Ego, and the absolute freedom with which he pursued his work led to the charge of atheism and his dismissal from Jena. At many points he challenged and fertilized the thought of his day. He criticized the Enlightenment, though he approved of its scientific work; he rejected the new historical concern as a basis for understanding, extolling metaphysics instead; and he disagreed with the neologists in their interpretation of Jesus, and held that orthodoxy falsified the way to salvation. By favoring a Johannine as against a Pauline interpretation of Christianity, he became the morning-star of the anti-Paulinism of the century. He interpreted Christianity as the heart and center of human history, a view which prevailed until Spengler. He echoed the Kantian insistence on the rational ethical will as the single potency for human history. Possibly his greatest contribution lay in his setting the bases upon which the idealistic philosophy of history, especially with Hegel, could be explicated. History from this view is to be seen as creative event, the creative power of history working through men and unifying their efforts. Religion and the state are the two bearers of the constructions of history, all history dividing into the pre-Christian and the Christian eras.

Hirsch next discusses the early romantics, concentrating on Schelling and Friedrich von Hardenburg (Novalis).

Whatever one may think of the romantics, it is simply true that all the poets, thinkers, and scientists of the first half of the nineteenth century bear the marks of their influence, as well as that of Kant and Schleiermacher. Schelling, early influenced by Fichte, later rabidly rejected the Fichtean and Kantian moral grounding for the idea of God, and turned to Böhme. Desiring a synthesis sufficiently broad to include all of nature, history, and art, Schelling turned from the philosopher to the artist, especially the poet, for the last and the highest word. In his later period, Schelling distinguished between the exoteric and the esoteric forms of Christianity, rejecting the former and affirming the latter. Protestantism marks the advent of the process of destruction of exoteric Christianity. In his assertion that Christianity is only apparently bound to the historical, but must really be considered as mythical-symbolic in a much more real way than the Indic or Greek religions, Schelling evoked Ritschl's judgment that his view of Christianity was "wholly comic"—and Hirsch lets the characterization stand. Of Novalis, the "romantic of all romantics," the wholehearted admirer of the "golden" middle ages, Hirsch says only that he obscured the fundamental question of the relation of faith to truth, held holy by the Enlightenment, and attempted to destroy this relation by his romanticism.

The chapter on the early, romantic period of Hegel's development is prefaced with a brief characterization of Hölderlin. The decisive concept of his thought, developed in the *Hyperion*, is that of life; and in Hölderlin's hands, this concept partakes of much of the old belief in fate, coupled with a near-panteistic panegyric on the divinity resident in nature's beauty. Hegel, in his early years, stood under the influence of Lessing, Kant, Fichte, Goethe, and Herder. His earliest writing, a *Life of Jesus*, indicated the extent of the influence of Lessing and Kant. But four years later, in his *Spirit of Christianity and its Fate*, the Hölderlin influence was clearly marked, and the dialectic began to make its appearance. Eight years after this, when he was thirty-

eight, Hegel turned away from romanticism. His understanding of Christianity had been determined by his separation of the metaphysical and religious from the objective and historical; his doubts of the historical bases of Church dogma, as seen in his rejection of the Resurrection and of miracles, were further developed than those of any German theologian before him. By his denying or relegating to unimportance all historical statements concerning dogma, he raised the question as to what role dogma would be permitted to fill. So prevalent, in fact, were critical doubts among the new theologians that only one of them could join his theology with the preaching office, and be true to his conscience: Schleiermacher.

Hirsch distinguishes three phases in the development of Schleiermacher's thought, and deals with the first two in the final chapter of Book VIII. The first phase, ending when Schleiermacher was twenty-eight, showed the marked influence of Kant; but this influence was exhibited in large part in the setting of questions rather than in the acceptance of answers. Kant's epistemology was accepted only with the concomitant denial of his doctrine of God and human freedom, and the recognition of a "secret" which is outside the claims of ethical certainty. Schleiermacher can be understood only if one recognizes that omnipresent tension between critical insight and religious certainty which was the *given*. There must be an attempt through philosophy to understand the essential in Christianity, but for the full experience and understanding of life, the claims of religion cannot be denied. When one speaks of Schleiermacher, it must always be remembered that he was a preacher *and* theologian. The second phase of Schleiermacher's development, a period of short duration but rich dimension, evidenced the influence of Spinoza, Fichte, and the romantics. There was a new view of the concept of the universe, showing the influence of Spinoza; but pre-eminently in his development of the concept of human individuality, Schleiermacher began to bind together the Fichtean

and romantic themes which were to set new patterns for theological development to the present time. In the *Reden* and the *Monologen* the human individual was seen as a unique entity with his own inner law. Yet, at the same time, he was a "compendium of humanity," bearing in himself the entire human nature with all its possibilities. Religion, as the "contemplation of the universe," must be separated from metaphysics and morals, and it is in this, Hirsch believes, that Schleiermacher proves himself to be a genuine romantic. As this spelled itself out in practical terms, it meant that Schleiermacher became a part of that embattled group of romantics who sought to reform the Church and reawaken living community by separating Church and state.

In the third period of his development, here merely introduced, Schleiermacher freed himself increasingly from the influence of Kant and Fichte. One concept of Fichtean idealism remained, however, and this concept (*des Gefühl*) was to be developed into increasing prominence in his systematic theology. Fichte had emphasized that in every act of knowing, the feeling is the point of union in that joining of appearance and thought which comprises knowledge. Schleiermacher accepted this, but transmuted it, for the Fichtean idealism could not, unconverted, serve the Church; and Schleiermacher was bound to this religious community in gratitude and service in a way which required that all thought and activity be exercised in its behalf.

In a fascinating summary concluding the eighth book of the work, Hirsch looks to the future, considers the relation of positivism and idealism, and finds them to be brothers under the skin. They are one in insisting that the key to the understanding of existence must be sought in the freedom and reason of man. Proceeding differently, positivism first considered nature and law and arrived at the question of the eternal at the end, if at all. Idealism posited human freedom and reason as the evidence of a depth derived from a relation to the eternal. They agreed that the Christian religion could not

give a reasonable proof of its truth from the standpoint of a God-given authority. Both opposed, in different ways, the Restoration. Positivism, with some influence from idealism, gave birth to the ideas of the radical enlightenment which eventuated in liberal-democratic and socialistic movements. Idealism dreamed the dream of a great synthesis and became the mother of the arts and sciences. For a century and a third, from Schleiermacher to Barth, the only attempt to bring unity was that of idealism; but in its dream of building a great people and a great national culture (*sic*) it conflicted continually with positivism. The breakthrough—if indeed it is that—came with the end of the first World War; for (*pace* Brunner) whether the new existentialism will permit a rebuilding and deepening of the spiritual in connection with the necessary demands of ongoing life is by no means clear. This is clear, however: there was a fateful meaning in the emerging purpose of the 1806 Schleiermacher; he cannot be viewed from any stance as an end, but must be seen as a beginning.

Book IX discusses the new directions of German theological thought, and is made up of six chapters: two contrasting rationalism and supernaturalism, one on the strife over the concept of the Church, one each on Hegel and Schleiermacher, and a final chapter on the influence of these men on the mediating-theology and on confession-alism. The initial chapter begins with a characterization of the general situation in theology at the end of the *Aufklärung*, i.e. in 1790. Kant is unique among all the philosophers thus far discussed in that his influence on theology was immediate. From his work, two *Stichworte* emerged, rationalism and supernaturalism. The failure of Wöllner's Edict symbolized the fact that the Enlightenment was finally stronger than the old embattled faith, and, following the Kantian rationalistic interpretation of Henke, Krug, Tieftrunk, and Niethammer, full-blown rationalism emerged with Röhre and Wegscheider. For Röhre, Christianity is the religion of reason, and revelation natural. Jesus, as the wise-man of

Nazareth, taught a universal religion concerning the relation of God and man, and there is no place for a doctrine of the person and work of Christ. Wegscheider insisted on a historical-critical understanding of the Bible, affirming that the rationalistic is the only genuine Protestant form of dogmatics. Paulus rendered historical service in rationalistic investigation of the Gospels, as the *Leben-Jesu-Forschung* assumed a place of primal importance. Three questions occupied the investigators in this period between Reimarus and Strauss: a) a true historical portrait of the life of Jesus; b) the problem of miracles as they relate to the historical consciousness; and c) the need for a developed literary criticism. In the early nineteenth century, this latter lack received much attention: in the Old Testament field with Eichhorn, de Wette, and Gesenius, in the New Testament field with Winer, Griesbach, and Lange. In addition, there was that "half-way rationalism" typified by Bretschneider which set as its main problem the joining of rationalism and supernaturalism. Bretschneider attempted this unconvincing reconciliation by abjuring the Augustinianism of the Reformation, asserting the primacy of the formal principle of Protestantism (the Bible) over the material principle (justification by faith), and declaring that the Christian's freedom from the Mosaic law was based simply on the "purer revelation" of Jesus.

Though Hirsch evinces little sympathy with the attempt to revive old themes characteristic of the supernaturalist neo-Pietism, he faithfully chronicles the diverse attempts which flourished in the first half of the century. Beginning with Storr, who fastened upon the Kantian dictum that the human reason has no competence in matters that transcend sense, the supernaturalists insisted that the Bible must be the source of all revelation to faith. Reinhard insisted that the supernatural revelation of the Bible could be bound together with the right use of reason to prove this revelation. Harms, on the other hand, rejected rationalism completely as atheism, and preached an anti-philosophical biblicism. So un-



compromising were certain of these opponents of reason that, after Collenbusch's effusion titled "How to distinguish the faith of the Devil from that of Herr Kant," Schleiermacher queried dolefully, "Shall the course of history be such that Christianity is supported by the barbarians and science by the unfaithful?" Menken, influenced by Bengel and in turn influencing F. J. Stahl, continued the biblicist approach on the basis of three fundamental beliefs. The Bible is God's absolute revelation and therefore the only authority for men, the Kingdom of God is to be interpreted chiliastically, and finally, the God of the Old Testament and of the New are indistinguishable. The price of this view, Hirsch believes, was very high, for Old Testament religion "mastered the Gospel," and Christianity was made over into a late Judaic theocratic messianism. Tholuck, anti-Enlightenment and anti-idealism, attempted to hold a Reformation interpretation, forgetting that "time makes ancient good uncouth." He was possible at all only in the time of the emerging neo-Pietism, and though he tried to repristinate such old beliefs as the Anselmic reconciliation theory and the centrality of the consciousness of sin, his lack of a criterion of unity led him to eclectic excesses. Neander comes off little better, for though he must be adjudged "the outstanding church historian between Planck and Baur," his genuine romanticism gave to his mediating position a diffuse character. Hengstenberg, "the program-director of the revival movement," turned his back completely on the Enlightenment, and took as his point of departure the essentially Reformed position that revealed truth is in the Bible alone. Hirsch obviously regards Hengstenberg as a man to conjure with, for on the basis of his insistence that the Bible is the simple and definite objective basis upon which Christian faith must be grounded, he out-flanked the historical critics and in effect reversed their victory. To believe in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch became with Hengstenberg a duty of faith, and to omit the slightest point of the Old Testament was to

omit Christ. Hengstenberg commanded a wide following through his *Evanische Kirchenzeitung*, but his position with respect to hermeneutics amounted to a substituting of one's own authority for that of scientific exegesis. J. T. Beck, biblicist extraordinary, believed he could found an entire dogmatic, without speculation, on the Bible. For him, the verbal inspiration which gave the Scripture its authority was quite unrelated to historical-critical study. Finally, there was a revival of demonology with Menken and Kerner, and the working out of a practicum on exorcism with J. C. Blumhardt.

One of the most volatile issues to require attention in the first half of the century was that touching the concept of the Church. The political re-organization effected by the Congress of Vienna, making necessary the formation of new *Landeskirchen*, made this issue "a central point of theological argument." The neo-Protestant concept of the Church welded together three apparently contradictory ideas. These were the rationalism of the Enlightenment, with its richly developed thought on Church and state, Hegelianism, with its union of the religious and scientific spirit in a universal representation of world-history, and the thought of Schleiermacher, viewing the Church as the instrument through which God works in his relation to the world. In this view the reality of the justification for the Church rests entirely in its power to evoke a loyalty of individual men for the truth. All bondage in religion is abjured, and yet all forms of culture are to be brought, freely, under the influence of Christianity. Those who criticize Schleiermacher for his *Kulturprotestantismus* often fail to consider that his purpose was not to secularize Christianity, but to give all secular culture a Christian basis. Throughout the strife over the Union, Schleiermacher, depending on the thought of Pfaff, argued for a separation of church affairs from the power of the state, but he held that a truly holy state, which was the end in view, would be realizable only where the Protestant community was conscious of its freedom, and contributed



as a community to that unity of conscience and spirit which was necessary. The outstanding opponent of Schleiermacher in this point, at least among the theologians, was Richard Rothe. For Rothe the processes that make for holiness in history operate in the natural, worldly community, and the Church is no more Christian than the state. What Christianity attempts to do is to bring men into a developing kingdom of a religious-ethical nature. Hirsch, from the vantage-point of a punctured progress doctrine, views Rothe's "spiritual kingdom with the prince as overseer" as falsely optimistic.

Another position on this baffling question was represented by the neo-confessionalism of Gerlach, Stahl, Löhe, and the latter's successors. The Church was here objectified as an institution, with binding confessions, orders, and officers. The concept of *Volkskirche* was denied, and opponents were anathematized as "unchurchly." Several strands were woven together in the concept of the Church as developed by these men. In addition to the unique emphases of the new orthodoxy, there was a considerable influence from traditional legal thought, and from the political Restoration. Authority instead of majority became the slogan, episcopacy was favored as an ideal arrangement, and the Scripture was interpreted according to the doctrinal positions explicated in the confessions. Löhe, the father of Bavarian confessionalism, exerted a powerful influence on Münchmeyer, Vilmar, Kahnis, and Kliefoth as he insisted upon the visibility of the Church and the true apostolicity of a Lutheranism which properly follows the confessional standards. At Erlangen also neo-confessionalism found an able champion in Harless. He insisted that Christian thought and activity can take place only within the Church, and this dependence on the Church means nothing except right order. Hirsch views this entire movement as doomed to failure, "for the spur of the *Aufklärung* had been driven deep into the German consciousness." The contention on the part of the neo-confessionalist that the Enlightenment represented a "fall,"

plus their insistence on the authority of the pastoral office (Schlatter related with relish how he, a theological professor, was regularly referred to by his pastor as "My son"), alienated them from those who desired a strong national Church with relatively lenient creedal requirements.

Between neo-Protestantism and neo-confessionalism there existed a third mediating view. Dorner, Nitzsch, and, to a degree, Wichern, made the attempt to steer between Scylla and Charybdis, siding neither with "hierarchy or anarchy." Dorner made Christology the center of his mediating attempt, interpreting the Church as the organ and instrument of Christ's work. Nitzsch, with Dorner's cooperation, prepared a short confession for Union ordinands, and was repaid by his opponents with the too-obvious pun that he tried to substitute the Nitzschean for the Nicene Creed. Wichern, the founder and indefatigable worker in the Inner Mission, sought to activate the principle of the universal priesthood of believers by insisting that the true purpose of the Church is attained only where the community accepts faith in Christ as a working reality: ergo the Inner Mission. Of the mediating theology it may be said that viewed as dynamic in purpose, it was a failure, for it did little mediating but became instead a sort of third position. Hirsch concludes this chapter with a discussion of Grundtvig, the Danish historian, poet, and pastor. Deeply concerned with the anemia of Danish Lutheranism, he made the "incomparable discovery" that the authority of Christ in giving apostolicity is dependent alone on baptism and its confession, not on the Bible. The Church is therefore made up of those who have been baptized and have not rejected the baptismal confession. Though Grundtvig was vigorously opposed by Martensen and Kierkegaard, he exerted real influence by freeing the people from the bondage of the letter.

In introducing the chapter that treats of the mature Hegel, Hirsch describes the greatness of the period following as in large part due to the work of Hegel and Schleiermacher in raising the viable questions. Though much vitu-

peration has been heaped on the heads of these two intellectual giants, especially by charging them with rationalism and/or pantheism, the fact remains that their influence on the Church has been profound. Hegel's basic interpretative theme—that there is a unity to reality and reason, and that this unity can be discovered via the dialectic—has, in the name of various *Entwickelung* adaptations, been widely employed even by those who attack it. Hirsch's principal interest in Hegel attaches to religious questions, and he believes that Hegel was primarily concerned with such questions. Philosophy itself is the knowledge of God, God is the absolute Idea, and the world is but a moment in the process of the self-unfolding of God to absolute Spirit. For those attempts to make religion a matter of feeling, Hegel had the deepest contempt, characterizing Schleiermacher's *Abhängigkeits-Gefühl* thusly: "If the feeling of dependence is the ground of religion, then a dog makes the best Christian." The essence of religion for Hegel is man's consciousness of God, and in explanation of this "speculative concept," Hegel quoted Eckhart approvingly: "The eye with which God sees me is the eye with which I see him. My eye and his eye are one." The two main questions which Hegel raised, which were to occupy a century's attention, were a) the problem of the truth of religion, and b) the problem of the truth of Christianity. On the former Hegel held that the religious consciousness is the basis of all higher human consciousness, and on the latter he affirmed that the teleological development of history is the basis for the grounding of the truth of Christianity as the absolute religion. The manner in which he distinguished faith and reason made possible a subjective criticism of the Enlightenment on the basis of biblical history and Church dogma without falling into the orthodox practice of precisely specifying the Christian content. On the problem of Christianity's place in world-history, Hegel declared that Christianity represents the very hinge of history, as the great state-building principle. By his explication of this Paul-

ine-Augustinian category he combatted the destructive effects of Voltaire and Rousseau. The final estimate of Hegel must include several considerations. His system contained modern and ancient Christian strains. In his mediation between Christian faith and the new consciousness of the truth-question he performed a service for Western culture that was absolutely necessary, though his particular handling of this relation need not be seen as the sole option. Finally, there was a dimension of depth to his Christian understanding, although the contemporary possibilities of the total situation no longer can be relevantly explored in terms of his Christian idealism. Indeed, the romantic-idealist position reached its climax with Hegel, and when Schelling attempted to extend it further he lapsed into Gnostic and theosophical absurdities which were strictly caricatures. There is more to be said in favor of the speculative theists, I. H. Fichte, Weisse, and Lotze, than for Schelling in this respect.

The chapter on Schleiermacher's philosophy and theology in its maturity, eighty-two pages in length, is a "must" for anyone concerned with modern theology. Hirsch begins by pointing out that Schleiermacher rejected the attempt to formulate a speculative dogmatics after the fashion of Schelling and Hegel. He refused to mix philosophical and theological questions, holding that the representation of Christian doctrine was independent of any and every philosophical system. However, there was an inner harmony to his thought which pervaded all of his work. The best example of this lies in the respective treatments, in his philosophical dialectic, and in his dogmatic explication, of the doctrine of God. In the former, the ideal and the real, the highest subjects of knowledge, are unified in the transcendent ground for which there is no possibility of suitable expression. In order four "lost possibilities" are discussed: a) the pantheistic understanding of the relation of God and the world; b) the representation of God as coming to be out of formless matter; c) God as nameless fate; and d) God as provi-

dence. What remains is the feeling of absolute dependence as the representation within us and things of the being of God. Schleiermacher saw, with a true eye, what the significance of the atheism-strife in Fichte's experience meant; and from this point on, the theologians of the century can be divided into those who grasped the significance of what Schleiermacher had done, and those "who thought, taught, and wrote as if nothing had happened." In the latter, the dogmatic explication of the *Glaubenslehre*, dogma is understood as the spelling-out of inner experience and the religious consciousness, with certain limits and rules thereby prescribed. The consciousness of absolute dependence, which is the basic element of all religious consciousness, becomes the central concept for this task of explication. Thus sin, as an example, rests on our consciousness of temporality, and fades away when the higher self-consciousness is developed: the realm of nature disappears in the realm of grace. On Christology, the two-nature doctrine is surrendered by fusing "the true being of God" which Jesus possessed with his indwelling God-consciousness; and the complete sovereignty which the latter held over him constitutes his sinlessness. Christ justifies us by taking us into community with him, and this fellowship becomes the basis of new life: hence Schleiermacher's service in and for the Church. Hirsch believes that the disparity between the Reformation doctrine of justification and that held by Schleiermacher has been greatly exaggerated. Post-Reformation evangelicalism, on the other hand, did exhibit the doctrine in a way that was unacceptable to Schleiermacher.

The last chapter of Book IX discusses the influence of Hegel and Schleiermacher on the mediation-theology and on confessionalism. There are seven likenesses which Hirsch discovers between the two men: a) both have the direction of their thinking shaped toward the problem of the essence of Christianity; b) both remain free from legalism of thought or life; c) both consider Christianity in its positive-historical appearance; d) both

see Christianity as the fulfillment of man through grace; e) both form their view of God and eternal life under the influence of the criticisms which had emerged in the atheism-strife; f) both understand the scientific world-view, but neither depends on mechanism; and g) both are systematic thinkers. Daub and Marheineke, two of the outstanding Hegelians, viewed the Christian religion *sub specie scientia*, and on this basis rejected both Scripture and Church doctrine as embodying the knowledge-principle. In their place they put the divine spirit, from which both Bible and Church came. Among those who reflect the influence of Schleiermacher, Hirsch discusses Nitzsch and Ullman, who concerned themselves with the problem of the essence of Christianity, Dörner, who sought to renew the doctrine of the Incarnation on the basis of a trinitarian position, Thomasius of Erlangen, who worked out a new kenosis doctrine, "Sin" Müller, and Richard Rothe, the clearest thinker of all the mediating theologians, and the only real system-builder among them. The great merits of the mediating school lay in their validation of the Reformation heritage in the German Church, their contribution to scientific-historical criticism (Holtzmann, Hase, and many others), and their willingness to wrestle with the deepest and the best in Schleiermacher.

In discussing the influence of Hegel and Schleiermacher on the confessionals, Hirsch restricts his concern to Harless and Hoffman of the Erlangen School. Harless, Lutheran churchman par excellence, was the real founder of the Erlangen theology. "The principal doctrine of Erlangen is the formulation of his experience." For Harless the experience of rebirth to faith, as given by Christ in the experience of conversion, is the point from which the contents of Scripture and of the confessions are to be grasped. This content is a self-validating "objective-correlate" to subjective experience, and stands in sharp contrast to Schleiermacher's insistence that the power of the spirit of Christ gives one a basis for building freely and critically from the histori-

cally given doctrines of the Christian religion. Hirsch believes that Erlangen, in spite of its loyalty to the Church and confessions, was in contradiction with Lutheran church doctrine. It lacked, because of the restrictiveness of its "experience principle," the fulness of statement in doctrine which was required. Hoffman, the deepest thinker of the Erlangen School, was strongly influenced by von Ranke. He became the first to use Luther against the Lutherans, and thus set the stage for all nineteenth and twentieth century Luther research. Theodosius Harnack, also of Erlangen, sought valiantly to make Luther a witness for Lutheran orthodoxy in his work on reconciliation and redemption of 1862, but by the time he completed the last volume twenty-four years later, Ritschl's work had made his attempt untenable. The great weakness of the confessionalists was their incompleteness. These men, along with the re-pristinators — Hengstenberg, Kliefoth, Vilmar, Stahl, Löhe, and Kahnis — presented a theology which was biblically and confessionally based, but which made no attempt to come to terms with science. The mediating theology did make this attempt to relate science to their understanding of evangelical Christianity, and must therefore be the true bearers of German evangelical theology.

The final book of this work is entitled "The Recognition of the Historical Reality of Jesus, and the Crisis of Christian Humanity," and contains three chapters. The first deals with Kierkegaard, and enhances Hirsch's reputation as a leading Kierkegaard scholar. Unlike those interpreters who find *l'affaire Regina* embarrassing and irrelevant, Hirsch sees this fateful sequence as the very key for understanding the melancholy Dane. His greatness, and the source of all he did as Christian thinker, poet, and author, lies in the fact that he was imprisoned in solitude by God, which was the meaning he placed upon this denouement. He saw himself first of all as author, called not only to lift up the meaning of the witnessing Church against the spirit of the time, but to

relate dialectically the meaning of being a Christian *while* being a member of the Church. Further, he tried to "think together" what it means to be a Christian (*Christsein*) with what it means to be a man (*Menschsein*) in the new human society. He was the first in this attempt to make the ground-datum the connection of "ideal humanity" with the experience of sin and grace. All his knowledge is self-knowledge, for his questions, ethical or religious, are always those which touch the existence of the individual. The measure of truth is inward, buried in the depths of the heart, and therefore the answer to the question of being a Christian will never be supplied simply by defining a Christian. In his analysis of the meaning of existence, pursued on the basis of his delineation of the three spheres, Kierkegaard made three significant contributions. For two hundred years the leading question of theological thought had been the relation of Christianity to the *natural* and the *reasonable*; with Kierkegaard, this question was set aside to consider the more important question of the relation of Christianity to the *human*. The Christian doctrine of sin and grace was put on a new basis, and the strife between ethical pessimism and ethical optimism thereby removed. Finally, there now became possible a new understanding of the relation of the ethical and the religious. In his interpretation of Christianity, he made many nineteenth century answers irrelevant even before they were advanced. The caprices of history, however, kept his interpretations locked away from the currents of thought, and permitted historicism its day in the sun. When, with the revived Nordic interest of Ibsen, Kierkegaard's concepts of scandal and despair, *incognito* and decision became common concepts, the true greatness of his devastating critique of *Kulturprotestantismus* became apparent. The "gentle Jesus meek and mild" construct was seen to be simply the paragon of nineteenth century virtue. It was in his *Training in Christianity* that the polemic against the fantastic form of the nineteenth century Christ was

carried out, along with the criticism of the attempt to prove the divinity of Christ from history. Kierkegaard did not sell out the historical Jesus, as the indictment often reads, insisting instead that the scandal of the real Jesus could not be facily removed. What he did attack was the attempt to prove by reason that which could be known only existentially by faith. Hirsch holds that he was limited in his understanding of historical criticism, but asserts that the great accomplishment of his life would hardly have been possible had it not been for this limit.

The second chapter of the tenth book traces the development of the historical-critical theology of the nineteenth century, focussing on Strauss, Baur, and Ritschl. Strauss symbolized the breaking loose of the historical investigation of the life of Jesus without any of the restraints in terms of the dogmatic determination of results. From the time of the Reformation, critical investigation had never been entirely lost from the evangelical Church, and under Semler there had been a casting off from old moorings. But it was with Strauss and Baur that this historical-critical investigation turned to Jesus and to the early Church, in an attempt to discover the essence of Christianity. When the Strauss *Life of Jesus* was published, the storm broke in full fury. "You had to live through it to believe it," Baur declared. Though the main criticism should have been directed toward Strauss' inadequate treatment of the sources, most of it was directed to his theological presuppositions. What he really accomplished, possibly to a greater extent in his *Dogmatics* than in his *Life of Jesus*, was the shifting of the site of the battle over Christian doctrine to the ground of historical investigation. Though he was victimized in the ensuing controversy, his dictum that "the true critique of dogma is its history" was later fully justified.

F. C. Baur is described by Hirsch as "the greatest and perhaps the most controversial theologian of German evangelical Christianity since Schleiermacher," a judgment in which he echoes Dilthey. Baur was the real orig-

inator of the historical-critical theology, and in his *Paul* and his *Critical Investigation of the Synoptic Gospels* produced two works that stand as landmarks in New Testament study. Baur's unfairly designated *Tendenzkritik* operated on the basis of two rules. Every early Christian writing must be placed in the setting of early Christianity in order to see the relationships, the writing then being interpreted in terms of these relationships. Secondly, any report of fact in these early Christian records must be seen in terms of the historical place of origin and judged according to the purpose in writing, never in isolation. As he attempted to get at the essence and origin of Christianity by way of historical-critical investigation, he made errors. The surprising thing is that, pioneering as he did, he was right as often as he was. In Gospel criticism, "all scientific work till today takes place on the ground which he prepared." Hirsch mentions four of Baur's questions which still remain as chief points of Gospel research: a) the new righteousness in relation to Mosaism, Pharisaism, and Paulinism, b) the Kingdom of God in relation to the late Jewish hope, to Christian universalism, to the present, and to eternal life, c) the messianic self-consciousness of Jesus and its relation to his consciousness of sonship and of mission, and d) the relation of Jesus' thought to that of the early Christian community.

Among those who followed Baur, there was no one approaching his stature, for the Tübingen School was under a cloud, and from the forties on there were no outstanding students. Tübingen graduates could not be placed; Ritschl, who had broken with Baur in 1857 and "had gone back to scientifically unfruitful standpoint as respects the historical criticism of the New Testament," is to be seen as the end of the old mediating-theology and the beginning of the new. He disengaged the mediating-theology from its speculative-pietistic basis, and substituted a positivist-historical basis. As the representative of the latter, he lies outside the pale of the historical-critical school, and of this work. Within



this school there were two attempts at an explication of dogma. Biedermann emphasized the necessity of metaphysical thought, and held that high metaphysical truths must in the final analysis be related to the religious consciousness. Pfeleiderer built a dogmatic on the basis of a religious-idealistic understanding of human existence, and at least kept alive this view of life at a time when naturalistic and historical-positivistic thought had consigned German idealism to limbo. "But the great systematic thinker which the historical-critical theology needed did not appear."

The final chapter of the total work—Chapter 55—discusses "the signs of a new time," and it is clear that for Hirsch, these are signs still open to alternative interpretations. The revolution of the second third of the nineteenth century touched all areas of political, economic, and social life. Industrialism arrived, and with it the doom of the romantic-idealistic epoch, though Lotze sought vainly to reassert speculative theism. Feuerbach, "the fanatic for veracity," began as a follower of Hegel, but deserted him and moved from an absolute to an anthropological concept of truth: "The measure of the race is the absolute measure, law, and criterion of man." His critique of religion, embodied in his atheistic phenomenological approach, was ruthless and devastating. Religion is untrue illusion, man's God-consciousness a fabrication of his subjective desires, Christianity the religion of the dreaming heart, and the basic dogmas wishes only. Feuerbach's "psychic pathology of religion and Christianity" exerted a wide influence on the younger generation. From the middle of the century, there was a vast outpouring of materialistic literature, authored by Vogt, Moleschott, Büchner, and their ilk. Darwinism, interpreted for Germany through the atheistic monism of Hückel, supplied the possibility for a new faith to those who had left the old. Du Bois-Reymond announced the text when he declared, "There is much that cannot yet be explained by physical, mechanical, chemical laws, but we may push ahead so

long as we remain true to this method."

Socialism, the strongest factor in the de-Christianization process, was worked out theoretically by Marx and Engels, who operated from a pseudo-Hegelian base and were strongly influenced by the French socialism of Saint-Simon. The atheism, materialism, industrialism, and Darwinism of 1840-1880 provided a ready seed-bed for this anti-Christian ideology, and the workers' movements of Germany, spear-headed by Liebknecht and Bebel, grew rapidly. Schopenhauer, interpreting religion as the satisfaction of the metaphysical needs of the unthinking masses, provided in his thought the first great example of atheistic religiosity. Keller interpreted Feuerbach through his poetry, and Raabe took Goethe and Schopenhauer as his great masters in his great historical tales. Raabe stands as a paradigm of the anti-Christian influence in letters, for example in his paraphrase of the petition in the Lord's Prayer to read "Give us this day our daily illusion." Hebbel, ranking beside Schiller and Kleist as the third great tragic poet of Germany, sought to relate the individual to the definite historical necessities of life. This was, indeed, "the problem of all problems for the nineteenth century."

Hirsch concludes with "a backward look" and a discussion of the prospects for the future. It is senseless, he believes, to speak of the spirit of apostasy and the demons of secularization as though epithets could solve the deep problems posed by the science and technical progress of the nineteenth century. The old historical basis of knowledge has been flouted, to be sure, and a new basis has replaced it. The only option for Christianity and theology, however, is to bring the truth which they possess to bear upon the real situation. This much can be said: in spite of the present ascendancy of anti-Christian powers, the two great geniuses given to the Church in the nineteenth century — Schleiermacher and Baur — have not been overcome. Any genuine theologian who would seek for an answer to present perplexities must plague himself with these men. The battle for the transformation



of Christian life and thought, and the placing of this thought in the center of the spiritual life of developing humanity, has not been won. We can see no more clearly than the men of 1860 what the issue of this battle will be. "The facts themselves remain open for any interpretation."

\* \* \*

This review has attempted to emphasize the content and scope of Hirsch's work rather than to challenge Hirsch's interpretative presuppositions or to indulge in panegyric. It may be helpful to suggest minimally certain of the points that would need to be considered had one attempted this critical analysis. 1) The major critical question would need to deal with the feasibility of writing a history of theology "in connection with the total movements of thought." An excellent review challenging Hirsch's procedure has been published in *Theologische Studien* (Heft 37, 1953) written by Max Geiger. 2) Some might cavil with Hirsch's choice of representative thinkers, or the relative weighting which he gives to each, but no one can complain that any significant thinker has been omitted. 3) Hirsch writes as a bloody but unbowed liberal; the presuppositions implicit within this position are certainly open to challenge. 4) The work is consistent in method of treatment, and stands favorable comparison with Barth's *Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* in this respect. What Barth does only in the *Vorgeschichte*, Hirsch

does throughout: working from original sources entirely, he notes and synthesizes each development in its relation to what has preceded and what comes after. Thus he interprets each thinker's work and influence contextually. Those who believe that historical writing is an art will find ammunition here. 5) Hirsch is a master of transition passages. He can capture the living ideas of particular movements, relate them to what has preceded and indicate their significance for the future, thus communicating the full sweep of a multiform historical development—a gift lamentably rare. 6) In this work one finds a historical orientation to most of the live questions of contemporary theological concern. For example, here is, *passim*, a rewarding history of the background of post-Reformation biblical study. Those who believe that the "neo-biblical revival" sprang fully clothed from the head of \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in your candidate), would do well to read Hirsch on Erlangen. 7) It is the abiding (and final) conviction of this reviewer that a good many contemporary theological battles would be fought more knowledgeably if the *Sitzfleisch* technique, practiced perforce by Hirsch in his race against blindness, would be emulated in the reading of his work. Much that is supposed original would be discovered in some antique protagonist of this or that; and one would in the process be treated to a first-rate and controversial (are they ever separate?) piece of historical writing.

## SURVEY OF RECENT LITERATURE

### ANCIENT CHURCH HISTORY

ROBERT GRANT, *University of Chicago*

The Second International Conference on Patristic Studies was held at Christ Church, Oxford, in September, 1955, under the leadership of F. L. Cross, and nearly four hundred *Patristiker* attended its sessions. The Conference was very carefully organized, and the meetings provided for (1) major addresses by such scholars as Molland, Daniélou, Florovsky, Chadwick, Marrou and others; (2) "master themes" introduced by various specialists in patristic philosophy, exegesis, and liturgical studies; and (3) a great many twenty-minute "communications," on a schedule which reminded one of Midway Airport. The communications too were arranged largely under subjects, but personal preferences resulted in a good deal of motion from room to room at the end of each. In short, like all conferences this one tried to combine some unity of themes with a large amount of diversity. A nearby coffee shop provided benefits for those who wanted some informal discussion or the renewal of old friendships. In my opinion, the Conference was a great success, and the stimulus it provided should be felt for some time. Many of the papers will appear fairly soon in the series *Texte und Untersuchungen*, now published in Berlin.

One of the most serious addresses, delivered in a light and amusing way, was given by H.-I. Marrou of Paris. Taking his point of departure from a series of excellent papers on Origen, he first suggested that more emphasis might be placed on (for example) Eusebius of Caesarea as an exegete, on Arianism, on the exegetical and theological tradition of Antioch rather than just Alexandria, and on the fathers of the fifth and sixth centuries. He then turned to methodology, which in Origenist fashion he divided into soul and spirit. Certainly we need critical editions of texts, but their importance can be exaggerated. He pointed to a nearby portrait of Potter, the great

editor of Clement, and used this "type" to symbolize the need for commentaries as well as editions. We need to discover "la directive intérieure" of the author, and to place him in the history of ideas in terms of his doctrine or exegetical method. This point led Marrou from soul on to spirit. We must resist the tendency to excessive specialization, except within a larger framework; we must bear in mind our goal, which is "connaître la pensée patristique prise comme une." The patristic scholar, who must be "profondement un humaniste," is trying to get at both the soul and the spirit of patristic thought, and he must avoid making premature or false distinctions between ancient, especially philosophical, and Christian thought. Finally, he urged scholars to remember that, in spite of their immersion in the thought of the early centuries, they have a responsibility to men of the twentieth century. They must be concerned with the modern relevance of their work.

Marrou's address aroused some response, including the suggestion that a patristic revival among the clergy would lead to greater unity, but it was my impression that many scholars did not want to consider the questions he raised. One might hope that at a future conference they would be more fully discussed.

The most exciting topic of the Conference seemed to be Gnosticism, and its current importance was indicated by two books. Several Oxford bookshops were displaying Walter Till's new edition of the *Apocryphon of John* and other gnostic papyri, and Gilles Quispel had brought an advance copy of the *Gospel of Truth*, which he has edited with Malinine and Puech. (Till's book—see Bibliography—is published by Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, and *Evangelium Veritatis*, by Rascher-Verlag, Zürich.) Quispel played a prominent part in the sessions, giving a major address and taking part in dis-

cussions with many scholars, including such "gnostics" as Polotsky, Sagnard, R. A. Markus, and the author. Unfortunately neither Puech nor Till could be present.

Out of the new documents and fresh insights is emerging the recognition that for the study of ancient church history the Nag-Hammadi discoveries have a significance closely resembling that of the Dead Sea Scrolls for biblical studies. And the Jewish elements in such gnosis as Valentinianism will have to be correlated with the thought of the sectarians by the Dead Sea, so that a much clearer picture of early Christianity's rivals can be obtained.

For this reason I have compiled a bibliography of some of the more important studies of Gnosticism, especially recent ones but also some of the earlier standard works—a bibliography which will probably also appear in a series called *The Library of Religion*, in a volume of translations of gnostic texts.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. General

## A. Sources

W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis*, Tübingen, 1932

H.-C. Puech, "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques," *Coptic Studies in Honour of Walter Ewing Crum*, Boston, 1951, 91-154

W. Till, "The Gnostic Apocryphon of John," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 3 (1952), 14-22

H.-C. Puech — G. Quispel, "Les écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung," *Vigiliae Christianae* 8 (1954), 1-51; "Le quatrième écrit gnostique du Codex Jung," *ibid.* 9 (1955), 65-102

W. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, Texte und Untersuchungen* 60, Berlin, 1955

M. Malinine — H.-C. Puech — G. Quispel, *Evangelium Veritatis*, Zürich, 1956.

## B. Studies

W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907

W. Bousset, "Gnosis" and "Gnostiker," Pauly-Wissowa, *Realen-*

*cyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (abbreviated RE) VII, 1503-47

E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et gnosticisme*, Paris, 1913 (ed. 2, 1925)

H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, Leipzig, 1924

H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist I*, Göttingen, 1934; II, 1, 1954 (review by A. D. Nock, *Gnomon* 12 [1936], 605-12)

R. P. Casey, "The Study of Gnosticism," *Journal of Theological Studies* (abbreviated JTS) 36 (1935), 45-60

S. Pétrement, *Le dualisme chez Platon, les gnostiques et les manichéens*, Paris, 1947

H.-C. Puech, *Le manichéisme*, Paris, 1949

G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion*, Zürich, 1951

G. Widengren, "Der iranische Hintergrund der Gnosis," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 4 (1952), 97-114

W. H. C. Frend, "The Gnostic Sects and the Roman Empire," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954), 25-37

F. L. Cross (ed. and tr.), *The Jung Codex*, London, 1955

## II. Judaism and Gnosticism

H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*, Cambridge, 1928

G. Scholem, "Ueber eine Formel in den koptisch-gnostischen Schriften und ihren jüdischen Ursprung," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (abbreviated ZNW) 30 (1931), 170-76

H.-C. Puech, "Numénios d'Apmée," *Mélanges Bidez*, Brussels, 1934, 745-78

C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, London, 1935

J. Thomas, *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, Gembloux, 1935

W. L. Knox, "The Divine Wisdom," *JTS* 38 (1937), 230-37

G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, New York, 1946

E. Peterson, "La libération d'Adam de l'ananké," *Revue biblique* 55 (1948), 199-214

- H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums*, Tübingen, 1949 (review by R. Bultmann in *Gnomon* 26 (1954), 177-89)
- H. J. Schoeps, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, Tübingen, 1950
- W. D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," *Harvard Theological Review* 46 (1953), 113-39
- R. Marcus, "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 73 (1954), 157-61
- G. Quispel, "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition," *Eranos-Jahrbücher* 22 (1954), 195-234
- H. J. Schoeps, "Das gnostische Judentum in den Dead Sea Scrolls," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 6 (1954), 276-79
- R. Marcus, "Judaism and Gnosticism," *Judaism* 4 (1955), 360-64
- III. Christianity and Gnosticism
- G. P. Wetter, "Eine gnostische Formel im 4. Evangelium," *ZNW* 18 (1917), 49-63
- H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, Uppsala, 1929
- H. Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatius-briefen*, Giessen, 1929 (review by A. D. Nock in *JTS* 31 [1929-30], 310-13)
- F. C. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis*, Cambridge, 1932
- W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen, 1934
- E. Percy, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der johanneischen Theologie*, Lund, 1939
- H.-W. Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien*, Gütersloh, 1940
- R. Bultmann, *Das Johannesevangelium*, Göttingen, 1941
- C. Maurer, *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium*, Zürich, 1949
- J. Dupont, *Gnosis*, Louvain-Paris, 1949 (review by R. Bultmann in *JTS* N. S. 3 [1952], 10-26)
- R. M. Grant, "The Origin of the Fourth Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950), 305-22
- W. Baumgartner, "Zur Mandäerfrage," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950-51), 41-71
- G. Bornkamm, "Die Häresie des Kolosserbriefes," in *Das Ende des Gesetzes*, München, 1952, 139-56
- C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1953
- L. Bouyer, "Gnosis: le sens orthodoxe," *JTS* N. S. 4 (1953), 188-203
- R. M. Grant, "The Earliest Christian Gnosticism," *Church History* 22 (1953), 81-97
- E. Molland, "The Heretics Combat- ted by Ignatius of Antioch," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954), 1-6
- G. Quispel, "De Joodse achtergrond van de Logos-christologie," *Vox Theologica* 25 (1954), 48-55
- R. M. Grant, "The Heresy of Tatan," *JTS* N. S. 5 (1954), 62-68
- H. Schlier, "Das Denken der frühchristlichen Gnosis," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Berlin, 1954, 67-82
- IV. Various groups and subjects
- A. Simonians
- L. Cerfaux, "La gnose simonienne," *Recherches de science religieuse* 15 (1925), 489-511; *ibid.* 16 (1926), 5-20, 265-85, 481-503
- L. H. Vincent, "Le culte d'Hélène à Samarie," *Revue biblique* 45 (1936), 221-28
- L. Cerfaux, "Simon le magicien à Samarie," *Recherches de science religieuse* 27 (1937), 615-17
- B. Ophites and Naassenes
- R. P. Casey, "Naassenes and Ophites," *JTS* 27 (1925-26), 374-87
- T. Hopfner, "Das Diagramm der Ophiten," *Charisteria Rzach*, Reichenberg, 1930, 86-98
- G. Bornkamm, "Ophiten," *RE* XVIII 1 654-53
- H.-C. Puech, "Archontiker," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christen- tum* I 633-43
- G. Quispel, "De oudste vorm van de gnostische mythe," *Nederlands*

- Theologische Tijdschrift* 8 (1953), 20-25
- R. M. Grant, "Gnosis Revisited," *Church History* 23 (1954), 36-45
- C. Carpocrates
- H. Kraft, "Gab es ein gnostiker Karpokrates?" *Theologische Zeitschrift* 8 (1952), 434-43
- D. Valentinians
- W. Foerster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, Giessen, 1928
- R. P. Casey, "Two Notes on Valentinian Theology," *Harvard Theological Review* 23 (1930), 275-98
- G. Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," *Vigiliae Christianae* 1 (1947), 43-73
- F. M. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée*, Paris, 1947
- G. Quispel, *Ptolémée: Lettre à Flora*, Paris, 1949
- R. A. Markus, "Pleroma and Fulfillment," *Vigiliae Christianae* 8 (1954), 193-224
- A. E. Brooke, *The Fragments of Heracleon, Texts and Studies I*, 4, Cambridge, 1891
- R. P. Casey, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*, London, 1935
- G. Quispel, "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne," *Eranos-Jahrbücher* 15 (1947), 249-86
- J. Mouson, "Jean-Baptiste dans les fragments d'Héracléon," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 30 (1954), 301-22
- F. M. Sagnard, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Extraits de Théodote*, Paris, 1949
- A.-J. Festugière, "Notes sur les Extraits de Théodote," *Vigiliae Christianae* 3 (1949), 193-207
- E. Peterson, "Engel- und Dämonennamen. Nomina barbara," *Rheinisches Museum* 75 (1926), 394-421
- H. Gressmann, "Jüdisch-aramäisches bei Epiphanius," *ZNW* 16 (1915), 191-97
- M. P. Nilsson, "Sophia-Prunikos," *Eranos* 45 (1947), 169-72
- E. Basilides
- P. Hendrix, *De Alexandrijnsche Haeresiarch Basilides*, Amsterdam, 1926
- J. H. Waszink, "Basilides," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* I 1217-25
- G. Quispel, "L'homme gnostique (la doctrine de Basilide)," *Eranos-Jahrbücher* 16 (1948), 89-139
- F. Poimandres and the other Hermetica
- R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, Leipzig, 1904
- J. Kroll, *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos*, Münster, 1914 (repr. 1928)
- W. Scott—A. S. Ferguson, *Hermetica*, I-IV, Oxford, 1924-36
- C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, London, 1935
- A. D. Nock—A. J. Festugière, *Hermès Trismégiste*, I-IV, Paris, 1945-54
- A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, I-IV, Paris, 1944-54
- M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, II, München, 1950, 555-96
- H. Gundel, "Poimandres," *RE* XXI 1193-1207
- G. Plotinus and gnosticism
- C. Schmidt, *Plotins Stellung zum Gnosticismus und kirchlicher Christentum. Texte und Untersuchungen* 20, 4, Leipzig, 1904
- R. Harder, "Plotins Schrift gegen die Gnostiker," *Die Antike* 5 (1929), 53-84
- H.-C. Puech, "Fragments retrouvés de l'Apocalypse d'Allogène," *Mélanges Franz Cumont*, Brussels, 1936, 935-62
- J. Bidez—F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, I-II, Paris, 1938

## SURVEY

### FIVE YEARS OF LITERATURE ON PROTESTANT MISSIONS

R. PIERCE BEAVER, *University of Chicago*

The past five years<sup>1</sup> have seen a large volume of missions literature come forth from the presses. There has been a new emphasis upon the biblical and theological basis of the mission and various aspects of theory. A large number of books have attempted appraisal of the current situation, and as usual much attention has been given to methods. History and Biography stand near the top in quantity, but the great majority of new books have dealt with Roman Catholic missions rather than Protestant.<sup>2</sup> However, among the relatively few books on Protestant missions history there are a few important items.

The missionary expansion of the faith is being accorded its rightful place in general church histories written by Protestant scholars. Kenneth Scott Latourette's widely used textbook, *A History of Christianity*, published by Harper and Brothers in 1953, follows in organization his monumental *History of the Expansion of Christianity*.

The *History of Christianity 1650-1950*, by James Hastings Nichols, published by the Ronald Press in 1956, gives considerable attention to the course of missionary expansion in modern times and the rise of the younger churches. At the same time "secular" historians are investigating the role of Western missions in cultural contacts, social change, and international affairs. A goodly number of recent Ph.D. dissertations in the universities have dealt with aspects of the history of missions, but few of them have been published.

The popular demand for a small general survey volume has resulted in the publication of a small book, *The Growth of the World Church: The Story of Modern Missions*, by Ernest A. Payne, published in London by

the Edinburgh House Press, 1955. In Germany a much more substantial survey, based on a life-time of scholarship, has been reissued in an enlarged and revised edition of *Die Weltmission der Kirche Christi: Ein Gang Durch Neunzehn Jahrhunderte*, by Professor Martin Schlunk (Stuttgart: Evang. Missions-Verlag, 1951). It now includes a section on missions to the Jews. The Inter-Varsity Press in Chicago, late in 1955, published *A Survey of World Missions*, by John C. Thiesen, intended as a textbook for conservative seminaries and Bible schools and a reader for conservatives generally.

The second volume of Wilhelm Oehler's *Geschichte der Deutschen Mission* appeared in 1951 (Baden-Baden: Wilhelm Fehrholz). This volume treats the period since 1885. Oehler's work is based largely on secondary sources, but presents a good survey of the German mission to non-Christians. Its great fault is the treatment of German missions in a vacuum without much reference to the total missionary enterprise.

Three important histories of missionary societies have been published during this period under review: Thompson's history of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Goodall's account of a recent half-century of the London Missionary Society, and Torbet's history of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society.

H. P. Thompson is the former editorial secretary of the S. P. G., and he is thoroughly at home in the sources with which he has worked. His two hundred fiftieth anniversary book is entitled *Into All Lands; The History of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-*



1950 (London: S. P. C. K., 1951). Rather than adding a sequel to Pascoe's *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, the author has wisely written a survey and interpretation of the Society's entire history. This is all the more fortunate since the earlier work is a chronicle and guide to the sources. Following an introductory chapter on "Beginnings" there are four main sections on "The American Colonies, 1701-83," "Years of Awakening, 1783-1851," "The Flowing Tide, 1851-1901," and "Consolation, 1901-50." Each section first discusses home affairs and administration and then chapter by chapter treats the various geographical areas. A goodly number of key personalities are brought to attention, and a vast amount of information is packed into a single readable volume. The S. P. G. moved from pastoral concern for British colonists, soldiers, and officials overseas to a genuine missionary outreach only under the pressure of the rapid growth of the Church Missionary Society and its remarkable achievements in foreign missions. Something of the resentment and suspicion of the older towards the younger agency may occasionally be sensed in the narrative. The Society, being in so many ways the overseas extension of the Establishment in England, was slow to achieve local autonomy and responsibility for its young churches. It now takes great pride in such autonomy, but often deludes itself concerning the extent to which an English bishop with many English and a few native clergy can genuinely be considered an indigenous church.

Another product of Thompson's studies into the origins of the S. P. G. is his biography of *Thomas Bray*, published by the S. P. C. K. in 1954. Bray was the founder of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge as well as of the S. P. G. Covering the same two and a half centuries and treating one of Thompson's many concerns is a book by Hans Jacob Cnattingius, *Bishops and Societies: A Study of Anglican Colonial and Missionary*

*Expansion, 1689-1950* (London: published for the Church Historical Society by S. P. C. K., 1952).

*A History of the London Missionary Society, 1895-1945*, by Norman Goodall (London and N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1954), continues Richard Lovett's centennial *History of the L. M. S., 1795-1895*. Since the book was commissioned by the L. M. S. as a supplement to Lovett's work, the author of necessity included an enormous mass of detail concerning persons and institutions which might easily have made the book dull and tedious. However, Goodall has proven himself a master craftsman and has overcome all the difficulties usually inherent in an officially commissioned work. Moreover, the author has done something most unusual in the writing of histories of societies, for he sets forth the story of the society in relation to the main political developments, to the work of other societies, and to the forces which affected the work of all missionary societies during the half-century. Goodall's experience as a secretary of the L. M. S., secretary of the International Missionary Council (he is now secretary of the Joint Committee of the World Council of Churches and the I. M. C.), and as an influential planner of co-operative strategy has afforded him rare insights. His judgment in playing up the story of missionary cooperation and in focusing on the development of the young churches, rather than on the society which fostered them, is excellent. The result is that Goodall's book is as much a history of the Protestant missionary enterprise of the first half of the twentieth century with respect to movements, trends, problems, and issues, as it is a history of the L. M. S. After a brief summary of the first century of the Society, eight chapters follow on geographical areas. Then comes an appraisal of the Society's policy in relation to the growth of indigenous younger churches; next chapters on educational and medical work; one on home base administration and support;

and following these a significant chapter on "Towards a Common Strategy," an effort in which the L. M. S. has played a leading role. The author discusses briefly the relations of the L. M. S. and the Congregational Unions within the larger context of "The Voluntary Society and the Church." A postscript summarizes some of the main developments since the end of World War II as the L. M. S. and the Christian world mission move into a new era. There are useful appendices on sources and the roll of missionaries and officers.

The third important history of a missionary agency is *Venture of Faith: The Story of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and the Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, 1814-1954*, by Robert G. Torbet (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1955). It is well written along the conventional lines of denominational missions history. The book has three main sections: "The Formative Years (to 1845)," "The Era of Expansion, (1845-1914)," and "Maturing Through Trial (1914-1954)." The first section is the story of the development of a denominational consciousness and organization among American Baptists from the initial response to Judson and Rice's appeal for support of their mission down to the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention and of pioneering, especially in Burma, India, and Siam. Each of the other two sections gives a large place to "Developments at Home," and a reader is impressed with the extent to which foreign missions has remained down to the present at the very center of the existence of the Baptists as a denomination. No other denominational missionary program has suffered so severely from the Fundamentalist controversy as that of the A. B. F. M. A., and Dr. Torbet treats this part of the story with remarkable restraint, but with forthrightness and clarity. The author is aware of the fact that the Baptist mission is only one part of a total world mission of the Protestant churches, but he has limited himself

to telling the Baptist story. Now and then he sets this story in the larger perspective of the total enterprise and of movements and trends at home and abroad, but he does not, as Goodall did with the L. M. S., employ the denominational story to demonstrate the course of the Protestant mission as a whole. Here is an excellent and well-balanced narrative and appraisal of the foreign mission of one denomination, but it would have gained great advantage if it had been set in a broader context.

Mildred W. Spain has brought out a second, revised, and enlarged edition of her history of the Central American Mission, entitled *'And in Samaria'* (Dallas Central American Mission, 1954). Other denominational histories, mostly popular, include: *The March of Methodism: The Story of Methodist Missionary Work Overseas*, by Cyril C. Davey (London: Epworth Press, 1951); *Med Sikte På Framtiden*, a short history of the Swedish Mission Covenant, by Rich Larsson (Stockholm: Missionsförbundets Förlag, 1954); and *Komme Ditt Rike: Det Norske Misjons-Allianse i 50 Aar 1901-1951*, by H. Hjelm-Larsen (Oslo: Den Norske Misjons-Allianses Forlag, 1951); and *Unter dem Sendungsauftrag Jesu Christi: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Gegenwart der Breklumer Mission*, edited by Wilhelm Andersen (Brekum: Christian Jensen Verlag, 1953). Closely related to foreign missions are two substantial books on overseas relief work: *In the Name of Christ*, a history of the Mennonite Central Committee, 1920-51, by John D. Unruh (Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1952), and *Quaker Relief: An Account of the Relief Work of the Society of Friends, 1940-1948*, by Roger C. Wilson (London: Allen and Unwin, 1952). Professor Andrew S. Burgess has edited a useful handbook on all the missionary efforts of the various Lutheran bodies in the United States: *Lutheran World Missions; Foreign Missions of the Lutheran Church in America* (Minneapolis: Augsburg

Publishing House, 1954). Dr. Wade Crawford Barclay is continuing work on the next volume of his *History of Methodist Missions*, and Dr. Fred Field Goodsell is engaged in preparing an interpretative history of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

The second and third volumes of *The Planting of Christianity in Africa*, by C. P. Groves, were published in 1954 and 1955 respectively (London: Lutterworth Press). They cover the periods 1840-1878 and 1878-1914, but the author states that the division is for the convenience of publication only and that he has attempted to depict a continuous development from 1840 to 1914. It should be recalled that whereas Protestant missionary literature usually treats Muslim North Africa as belonging with the Near East and regards as "Africa" the remainder of the continent south of the Sahara, Professor Groves treats the entire continent as a unity. This is the most extensive and substantial work in the field of the history of missions now in process of publication. The proliferation of missionary efforts from so many bases in different parts of Africa after 1840 renders it difficult for the author to carry forward his story by stages rather than by parallel regional accounts, but the regional development is kept subordinate to the over-all picture. These two volumes cover the fascinating story of pioneering, which continued almost down to the end of the period, the missionary occupation of a vast continent, and the involvement of missions in colonialism. The fourth and final volume is in press. A few lines in a general review article cannot do justice to Grove's work and further comment will be reserved until the entire work has been issued.

An excellent regional study is *The Missionary Factor in East Africa*, by Roland Oliver (London: Longmans, Green, 1952). Edwin W. Smith's Phelps-Stokes Lectures, entitled *The Blessed Missionaries*, treat certain as-

pects of missionary work and influence in South Africa (London: Oxford University Press, 1951). An interesting missions reader on the same area has also appeared: *South African Missions, 1800-1950*, by Horton Davies and R. H. W. Shepherd, published in London by Thomas Nelson, 1954. This anthology includes one hundred forty passages and an introductory historical sketch. Fridtjov Birkeli's important study of missions and political affairs in Madagascar has a helpful English summary: *Politikk og Misjon* (Oslo: Egede Instituttet, 1952). Other historical writing treats denominational missions and includes: *Lutheran Mission in Liberia*, by Harold V. Whetstone (N.Y.: Board of Foreign Missions of the United Lutheran Church, 1955); *The Story of a Mission*, by T. S. Johnson (London: S. P. C. K., 1953,—story of the C. M. S. Mission in Sierra Leone); and *Led in Triumph*, by Ethel T. Wharton (Nashville: Board of World Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., 1952,—story of Presbyterian Congo Mission).

The Danish jubilee anniversary at Aden has called forth *Ved Mølepaalen; 50 Aars Dansk Misjon i Arabien*, by Borch M. Jensen, published by the Danish Missionary Society at Hellerup in 1954.

The greatest historical celebration in India has been the 250th anniversary of the founding of the Danish-Halle Mission by Ziegenbalg and Plütschau. In addition to the reissue of older literature, including Beyreuther's *Life of Ziegenbalg*, and some pamphlet literature, Professor Arno Lehmann of Halle has especially produced a book published both in German and English versions: *Es Begann in Tranquebar: Die Geschichte der Ersten Evangelischen Kirchen in Indien* (Berlin: Ev.-Verlagsanstalt, 1955) and *It Began in Tranquebar* (Madras: Christian Literature Society, 1956). *The Lutheran Enterprise in India, 1706-1952*, edited by C. H. Swavely, anticipated the celebration

by four years (Guntur, India: Lutheran Publishing House, (1952). The centenary of the American Methodists in India was marked by the publication of *South of the Himalayas: One Hundred Years of Methodism in India and Pakistan*, by James K. Mathews (N. Y.: Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, 1955). The history of the negotiations leading to the formation of the Church of South India has been well written by Bengt G. M. Sundkler in *Church of South India: The Movement Towards Union 1900-1947* (London: Lutherworth Press, 1954). A sketch of that new church's first five years will be found in *The Pilgrim Church*, by Marcus Ward (London: Epworth Press, 1953).

A former missionary, Leonard M. Outerbridge, has attempted a critical survey and interpretation of all past efforts to establish the Christian Church in China as the basis for judgment on the Protestant effort in that land. His title, *The Lost Churches of China*, indicates his viewpoint (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1952). While certain weaknesses, such as disunity and slowness to adapt the Chinese cultural heritage, are well pointed out, the author's criticisms are on the whole not fully convincing. Other China items include: *From Six to Sixty to Six: A Narrative of a China Mission*, by Arthur V. Casselman (Philadelphia: Board of Foreign Missions of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, 1951); *The Bible and China*, by William H. Hudspeth (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1952); and *Then Till Now in Formosa*, by Hugh MacMillan (Taipei: English and Canadian Presbyterian Missions in Formosa, 1953). The United Board for Christian Colleges in China has commissioned the preparation of a series of monographs on the former Christian colleges in that country, and the following, each published by the Board in New York, have been issued: *Fukien Christian University*, by Roderick Scott (1954); *Shantung Christian University* (Cheeloo), by Charles H. Corbett (1955);

*St. John's University, Shanghai*, by Mary Lamberton (1955); *Hangchow University*, by Clarence B. Day (1956); *Soochow University*, by W. B. Nance (1956); and *Ginling College*, by Mrs. John L. Thurston and Ruth M. Chester (1955). Professor M. Searle Bates is at work on a study of the Christian mission in China during the first half of the present century.

*Kruis en Kurwar: Een Hondard-jarig Waagstuk op Nieuw-Guinea*, edited by F. C. Kamma, is a symposium on a century of missions in New Guinea (Den Haag: Voorhoeve, 1953). There are two small books on the Anglican Diocese of Borneo: *The Wings of the Morning*, by Arthur F. Sharp (London: Greaves, 1953) and *Borneo, Past, Present, and Future*, by Nigel E. Cornwall (London: S. P. G., 1953). With relation to the Pacific area there are three noteworthy publications: *Missionary Influence as a Political Factor in the Pacific Islands*, by Aarne Koskinen (Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennicae, 1953); *Nine Doctors and God*, by Halford J. Francis (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1954); and *Yankees in Paradise, The New England Impact on Hawaii*, by Bradford Smith (Philadelphia and N. Y.: Lippincott, 1956). Smith is concerned with his subject in the broadest sense, but the American Board missionary and their descendants occupy the central place, and he has made full use of the American Board archives. It may be noted also that the Missionary District of Hawaii of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A. in 1952 issued a small booklet on the nine decades of its history, entitled *The Episcopal Church in Hawaii—Ninety Years of Service, 1862-1952*.

There is little to mention with respect to the Americas. Cornell University Press at Ithaca has this year, 1956, published *Wilderness Christians: The Moravian Mission to the Delaware Indians*. The history of Southern Baptist Missions in Brazil is narrated in *Baptists in Brazil*, by Asa R. Crab-

tree (Rio de Janeiro: Baptist Publishing House, 1953).

1. See the first of these review articles for earlier literature: "Research and Some Recent Publications in the History of Missions," Vol. 20, No. 3 (September, 1951), pp. 85-90. Other reviews of missions literature will be found in Vol. 21, No. 4 (December, 1952), pp. 345-364, and Vol. 22, No. 1 (March, 1953), pp. 50-53.
2. For some of the recent literature on the history of Roman Catholic Missions, see the article on Jesuit missions material in Vol. 22, No. 4 (December, 1953), pp. 329-336.

## DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"The Reaction of the Religious Press in America to the Emergence of Nazism." By Frederick K. Wentz (Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Penna.). Yale University, 1954. Director: Ralph H. Gabriel.

This study probes the patterns of thought of American religious spokesmen on the subject of our society and religion's relationship to it as these thoughts were evoked by the challenge of a foreignism. Specifically, twenty-seven representative journals were studied in their reaction to Nazism from 1933 through 1937.

For American religious observers Hitler's advent was proof that western civilization had entered the collective age. This meant bad times to most of them. However, they saw religion becoming increasingly relevant to sociopolitical affairs, since the new and powerful social movements of communism and resurgent nationalism were taking on the fervor and form of religion. The Judeo-Christian faiths had failed in some way, it was held, in their influence upon society.

Though a noteworthy degree of diversity characterized the reaction to the emergence of Nazism, four main attitudes were evident. A left-wing group, made up of the Jewish representatives and those Protestant organs with liberal or socialist political viewpoints, expressed strenuous opposition to the reactionary nationalism of the Nazis because they sought social justice in society and felt that religion should relate itself directly to society by giving prophetic leadership to the forces that make for justice. Liberal and post-liberal sub-groupings provided important divisions of attitudes within this general group.

The main Protestant group, while they showed greater concern for America's welfare than for European affairs, opposed collectivism as found both in chauvinistic Nazi nationalism

and in atheistic communism because they sought international peace and the protection of personal freedom in society, and because they felt that religion, remaining separate and free from society, should wield indirect yet tangible influence.

Right-wing millennial Protestant journals, seeking signs of the times in contemporary events, found in Hitler another distasteful example of the rising modern collectivism which was more spectacularly evidenced in Mussolini, communism, and Roman Catholicism. They felt that the Christian Church should withdraw itself from a society upon which God's judgment was soon to reach a smashing climax at Armageddon.

Roman Catholic spokesmen sought to bring order into society in accord with God's pattern for it and felt that this was to be accomplished by the dominance of the Roman Church as God's divine-human instrument. Since communism was their greatest enemy, Hitler was accepted as an unpleasant ally against communism, except in his attacks upon German Catholicism, especially as these increased after 1935.

The following magazines were studied: *America*, *American Hebrew*, *The Brooklyn Tablet*, *Christendom*, *The Christian Advocate*, *The Christian Century*, *Christian Faith and Life*, *The Christian Herald*, *The Christian Register*, *The Christian Science Journal*, *The Churchman*, *The Commonwealth*, *Friends Intelligencer*, *The Improvement Era*, *The Jewish Forum*, *The King's Business*, *The Lutheran*, *The Menorah Journal*, *The Moody Monthly*, *National Baptist Voice*, *Opinion*, *Radical Religion*, *Religion in Life*, *The Sunday School Times*, *The Watchman-Examiner*, *The Watchtower*, *The World Tomorrow*.

"Dr. Robert Barnes and Anglo-Lutheran Relations, 1521-1540." By Neelak Serawlook Tjernagel (Con-



cordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois). State University of Iowa, 1955. Director: Herbert Rowen.

During the reign of Henry VIII English foreign policy was characterized by frequent changes in direction and aim. Cardinal Wolsey, whose purpose had been the creation of an Anglo-French alliance, was succeeded in the king's favor by Thomas Cromwell, who saw in the protestant princes of Germany the best hope for achieving the king's purposes in England. The problem inherent in the Anglo-Lutheran relations during Cromwell's tenure of office was the fact that Henry VIII was primarily interested in a political alliance, while the Lutheran princes had organized the Schmalkaldic League for the sole purpose of preserving the theology of the Lutheran Reformation.

The English king's reluctance to accept Lutheran theology even after his repudiation of the Pope, was due in large part to the vigorous and highly-publicized attack he had made in 1521 against the religious tracts of Martin Luther. A number of factors, however, conspired to weaken the king's orthodoxy and to mitigate his hostility toward Lutheranism. The Cambridge humanists were an additional factor in directing England toward Protestantism. Their first interest in the theology of the Reformation had coincided with the appearance of a new edition of the New Testament prepared by Erasmus and published in 1516. Secret meetings of these Cambridge men included nearly all of those who were to be significant in the early history of the Anglican Church.

The primary interest in this study lies in the career of Robert Barnes, the leader of this Cambridge group, who was tried for heresy by cardinal Wolsey for alleged contentious, seditious, and heretical statements made in a Christmas Eve sermon in 1525, in which he made the first public declaration of the faith of these first English Protestants. The penalty for his offense was a rather loose confinement in pri-

son during which time he engaged himself in the sale of Tyndale's Bible. That activity endangered him further and he fled to Germany. Three years under the tutelage and influence of Wittenberg reformers made him a thorough-going Lutheran, a fact amply attested by the theological essays he wrote in those years.

It was on the basis of those writings and on a profession of loyalty to the king that Henry VIII brought Dr. Barnes back to England to represent the cause of the crown at the forthcoming conferences with the Schmalkaldic princes. The result of Barnes' activities in that role was that the English doctrinal formulas of the 1530's as well as the Anglo-Lutheran theological agreements of 1536 and 1538 became more and more Lutheran in tone as well as in content.

In 1540 Henry VIII abandoned the efforts to establish an alliance with the subjects of Charles V. The doctrinal formulas of the previous decade were disavowed by the Act of Six Articles and the execution of both Cromwell and Barnes.

The efforts of Barnes, and the doctrinal agreements that had been made were not without effect, the king's repudiation of them notwithstanding. They remained to form the basis of the later and the lasting Thirty-nine Articles of the Elizabethan Settlement. Just as Thomas Cranmer was the connecting link between Lutheran and Anglican liturgical practice, so Robert Barnes was the link between the theology of the Wittenberg Lutherans and that of the Church of England. His part in founding the faith of the Anglican Church is far greater than appears in the apparent failure of his personal career. A re-evaluation of his life and work in the reign of Henry VIII is the objective of this study.

---

"The Transcendentalists as Church Reformers: Conflict and Experimentation in American Unitarianism, 1836-1853." By William R. Hutchison (Hunter College). Yale Uni-

versity, 1956. Directors: Sydney Ahlstrom, David Potter.

In this study the American Transcendentalists of the mid-nineteenth century are discussed as reformers of the theology, ecclesiastical organization, and social outlook of the Boston Unitarianism with which most of them were closely associated. Both the religious ideas of the reforming group and the reactions of the non-Transcendentalist Unitarians are treated in detail. The central problem is the dilemma of a liberal Christian communion forced to choose between a tradition of unlimited free inquiry and an equally compelling commitment to the Christian confession.

After two chapters describing, respectively, the Unitarian religion of the 1830's, and the background and structure of Transcendentalist religious thought, the conflict between the conservative Unitarians and the younger reforming group is examined. This part of the study falls topically and chronologically into two sections. In the first, covering the period from 1836 to 1840, Emerson and George Ripley on the Transcendentalist side, and Andrews Norton, leader of the conservative opposition, receive the greatest share of attention. In the second section, dealing with the years between 1840 and 1853, Theodore Parker emerges as the Transcendentalist champion, while such men as Ezra S. Gannett and Samuel K. Lothrop represent the conservative stand. Since the factional controversy in both periods was carried on mainly in the denominational publications, these, along with the Andrews Norton Papers, were the major sources for study of the dispute.

A more concrete examination of

Transcendentalist religious ideas is contained in a further chapter which describes the experimental churches founded by such reformers as James Freeman Clarke, Orestes Brownson, William Henry Channing, and Theodore Parker. With materials drawn from manifestoes, instruments of organization, contemporary descriptions, and the writings of the experimenters themselves, this part of the study is intended to show how Transcendentalist principles of anti-formalism, social action, and what today would be called "ecumenicity" were put into practice, and to what extent they proved viable as bases for congregational organization.

Historians have commonly treated the relationship between the Transcendentalists and their Unitarian opponents as a simple dispute between youthful champions of essential religious values and their tradition-bound elders. The more conservative Unitarians have often been depicted as colorless, angrily intolerant, and on the whole rather ridiculous persons. The dissertation under discussion makes use of conservative apologetics as well as of the Transcendentalist literature which usually has been given almost exclusive attention in writings on this subject. While not denying the value or significance of Transcendentalist religious ideas, it points out that the conservatives were defending a theological system which did, despite the Emersonian dictum, contain something more than "pale negations," and that they were able to make a convincing case against the weaker points of Transcendental theology. The study shows, also, that Andrews Norton was almost alone in his espousal of a conservative policy which could justly be described as harsh or suppressive.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Letters of John of Salisbury. Vol. One: The Early Letters (1153-1161).* Edited by W. J. MILLER, S. J., and H. E. BUTLER, revised by C. N. L. BROOKE. London and New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1955. lxvii-296 pages (double numbered). \$8.00.

This work, to be completed in three volumes, strengthens an already estimable series, *Nelson's Medieval Texts*. The set includes translations with critical notes of such works as Lanfranc's *Monastic Constitutions*, Jocelin of Brakelond's *Chronicle*, and Innocent III's *Letters*. The present volume continues the characteristic series plan of parallel Latin and English pages properly keyed to the best manuscripts, printed editions, and secondary literature. It is likewise prefaced by lucidly written introductions with bibliographies and tables. Appendices and index make up a more than adequate piece of editing.

The first collection of John's letters is introduced against the background of the great humanist's early life. This accents his student days at Chartres and Paris (1138-c.1147); his clerkship to Peter of Celle (1147-1148); his first service in the Curia of Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury (c. 1148-c.1150); a period of residence in Rome, possibly involving a papal clerkship or perhaps only a properly accredited representation of Theobald at the Roman Curia (1150-1153); and, beginning with 1153 or 1154, a period as "the archbishop's trusted confidant and secretary."

The pages of the introduction devoted to the significant, if often undervalued, role of Theobald in the relation of temporal and spiritual powers provide a properly dramatic background for the archbishop's letters in general and for the concluding ones in particular. Here, and throughout the present corpus, the epistles dictated by Theobald emerge with an added

coloration that reflects the literary craft and interpretative powers of John the humanist.

These letters written for Theobald to popes, monks, kings, royal chancellors, and fellow ecclesiasts reveal as much of John as do the great clerk's own missives to such correspondents as Peter of Celle, Bartholomew of Exeter, Thomas Becket, and Master Ralph of Sarre. In a sense, all are John's, though less than one third bear his name. Taken as a whole, this early segment of the *Letters* may play as large a part in the understanding of the times as the possibly more lively ones to follow.

RAY C. PETRY

Duke University

*Luther: Letters of Spiritual Counsel.* (Vol. XVIII: *The Library of Christian Classics*.) Edited by THEODORE G. TAPPERT. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. 367 pages. \$5.00.

Luther's very name evokes an image of a heroic giant striding across the stage of history, a *Wundermann*, a divinely inspired leader. This volume reveals the other Luther, one of the most human of the world's great men, the *Seelsorger*, the deeply Christian minister. Luther's magnificent letters cover the entire range of pastoral problems. They are arranged chronologically within general topics, as letters to the sick and dying, and the like.

Here is a volume which of all the excellent titles in the *Library* is both the most inspiring and the most immediately useful to the pastor. It will find its way into seminary classes and into parish libraries as well. Luther's loving concern led him to true evangelical counsel, sensitive but not sentimental, positive yet flexible, spiritual and realistic, rooted in the Word. His aim was to help men to have faith and as members of the universal priest-

hood to exercise the love which comes from faith.

Dr. Tappert is an experienced translator who is currently one of the contributing editors of the new fifty-five volume American Edition of *Luther's Works*. He has here made a fresh collection from the approximately three thousand extant letters and has included many of major importance also to the historian, letters to his wife and parents, Elector Frederick, Queen Mary of Hungary, King Christian of Denmark, Prince George of Anhalt, and Joachim of Brandenburg. One group of letters illustrates in concrete context Luther's general principles on the relationship of church and state. The letters are supplemented with relevant selections from the *Table Talk*. Economic and social problems related to developing capitalism deserve more adequate treatment than they receive here. The volume has a good general index and a listing of Biblical references. Its general human interest and scholarly excellence commend it to all, but especially to pastors and historians.

LEWIS W. SPITZ

University of Missouri

---

*Selected letters of John Wesley.*  
 Edited by FREDERICK C. GILL. New  
 York: Philosophical Library, 1956.  
 viii + 244 pages. \$4.75.

The editor of this volume of John Wesley's letters is a British Methodist clergyman who, in a previous work, published a selection of *John Wesley's Prayers* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951). The standard edition of *The Letters of John Wesley* edited by John Telford in eight volumes (London: The Epworth Press, 1931) contains nearly twenty-seven hundred letters. While providing, along with the *Journal*, an unparalleled portrait of Wesley, the perusal of the Telford edition is a formidable task for the average reader.

Mr. Gill's selection of letters from the Telford edition is amiably discern-

ing. Every type of letter is represented.

Intimate glimpses into Wesley's private life are mirrored in representative letters to his mother, his brothers and sisters, and to the young women who, from time to time, excited his romantic fancy. Particularly one may note the correspondence with his wife which reflects the inevitably tragic dimensions of this relationship.

In many ways the *Letters* of Wesley are more autobiographical than the *Journal*, for in the former there is a more subtle self-disclosure. Indeed Wesley may have been aware of this fact and one may not be unkindly inclined to believe that such was a motive in preserving his vast amount of correspondence. One learns much as he reads a letter written to his mother wherein he confesses a school boy's heart-ache for "my being little and weak" and a desire to "trace the wisdom and mercy of Providence in allotting me these imperfections." In contrast Wesley's polemical apologetic for the people called Methodist set forth in his letter to King George II may be cited.

The editor of this selection of John Wesley's letters has thoughtfully included the letter to Vincent Perronet (over seventeen printed pages) which contains "a plain account of the whole Methodist plan, its origin, basis, constitution, and advantages"—without question the most succinct and authoritative statement we possess on the subject. This volume meets a real need among those who share in the contemporary resurgence of Wesley studies.

DAVID C. SHIPLEY

Perkins School of Theology

---

*Documents sur le Protestantisme montbanais au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle.* Edited by DANIEL LIGOU with an introduction by Emile-G. Léonard. Toulouse: Imprimerie universitaire, s.d. Pp. lxxxvii, 114, illustrated.

The appearance of this volume will be welcomed by all students of French

Protestantism and by those who respect the celebrated dictum of A. Aulard: "Allez aux sources!" M. Ligou has discovered and publishes herein the proceedings of the colloquies of the Reformed Church of Montauban for the years 1751 to 1766. The work constitutes a valuable addition to the knowledge of French Protestantism in this period, for such records are fragmentary, and these are an important supplement to the only other publications of this kind: Edmond Hugues, *Les Synodes du Désert* (Paris, 1885-1886), 3 vols., and Eugène Arnaud, *Supplément aux Synodes du Désert* (Paris, 1892).

The period concerned is a crucial one in the history of the French Reformed Church in the 18th century. It encompasses the last decade of what is generally called the "Désert héroïque" (the period of active persecution of the Huguenots by the state) and the first decade of the "second Désert" (the period of *de facto* toleration). While the documents tell us almost nothing of the theological and spiritual aspects of Protestant life in France at this time, they are most revealing of the day-to-day problems faced by one of the more important French Protestant communities—the acute shortage of educated pastors, the hazards of intermittent persecution and Huguenot endeavors to give succor to the victims of this persecution, the attention they devoted to the maintenance of baptismal and marriage records in order to preserve their identity as Protestants, and the disciplinary measures they were forced to take against those of their numbers who, in order to protect their civil status and worldly possessions, baptized and married in the Roman Catholic Church.

More important, certainly, is the light these documents throw on certain social and ecclesiastical characteristics of the church during the second Désert. An irregular orthography and inexact arithmetic in the earlier documents testify to the predominantly peasant character of the church at this time, but an increasing sophistication in the

records bears witness to the gradual return to the faith of the middle class and of its growing influence and control over the affairs of the church. This social transformation brought new and acute problems to the Huguenots—problems which were to have dire consequences for the Reformed Church and which help to explain its disheartening collapse during the dechristianization movement of 1793-1794. It was during this period that a pastorate, which aspired to the establishment of an ecclesiastical hierarchy within the church, joined issue with elders and the laity who successfully defended the traditional presbyterian system of church government. Here, too, there developed alongside the religious assemblies in the Désert (which often attracted Protestants by the thousands and even tens of thousands) a devotional life centered in "societies" limited in membership numerically and socially—an innovation which ultimately led to a social schism between peasant and bourgeois Protestants.

The value of these documents is further enhanced by two introductions, one by the most distinguished living historian of 18th century French Protestantism, Professor Emile-G. Léonard, and the second by the editor of the documents, M. Daniel Ligou. Taken together, they help to establish the nature of the milieu from which these sources originated.

BURDETTE C. POLAND  
*University of Nebraska*

---

*Wilderness Christians: The Moravian Mission to the Delaware Indians.* By ELMA E. GRAY in collaboration with LESLIE ROBB GRAY. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1956. xi + 354 pp. \$5.00.

This is the story of one of the most important missionary ventures of the Moravian Brethren—that to the Delaware Indians, the most docile of the Moravians' red-skinned converts. From mid-eighteenth century beginnings of the mission in the Blue Moun-

tain region of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Gray traces the successive moves of the mission to Western Pennsylvania, present Ohio and Michigan, and ultimately to Upper Canada (Ontario Province) where, with many discouragements, the mission on the Thames River was continued until 1902.

The volume is the product of much painstaking research. The author has carefully studied the published accounts of Moravian missionary work, and has enriched the story with new source material from manuscript collections in the United States and Canada. She has also made good (and judicious) use of local histories, little-known pamphlets, and periodical literature.

The story of the Delaware Mission has been completely told with not a single stone left unturned in the author's search for information. The faults of the book are, therefore, those of commission and *not* omission. In fact, the story would have suffered little if half the wordage had been omitted. Before the main narrative begins, two long and rather tedious "running starts" trace the migration of the Delawares from "the western portion of the American continent" (p.1) to the Lehigh Valley and that of the Moravians from Bohemia to the same location. The *minutiae* of the daily lives of the missionaries and their converts are gone into even to the point of listing menus, inventorying linen closets, and describing the process for making candles from beeswax. This is the sort of thing which in serious historical writing is best used sparingly. Mrs. Gray is, to say the least, more than generous. There are, furthermore, long and wholly unnecessary "purple" descriptive passages and completely distracting paragraphs devoted to philosophizing on Moravian virtues.

In proportion to its numerical membership, no other Christian body has directed so much effort toward Christianizing the Indians as have the Moravians. The tireless and heroic efforts notwithstanding, in the total picture of American Christianity the result seems

small in proportion to the labor. Mrs. Gray's most significant contribution is her interpretation of the ultimate failure of Moravian missionary work among the American Indians. It is implicit throughout the volume that the Moravian missionary objectives and techniques were somewhat faulty. Always, the Moravians settled their converts in communities where the Indians were expected to adopt not only white man's ways, but Moravian ways. Mission settlements were first made in the Indian country, where the chief occupation of the missionary was to keep the Christian Indian from reverting to his former paganism. As white men took up the lands near the mission, the missionary's task became one of protecting the red man from the white man's vices and from exploitation by the new settlers. Thus defections were not only from the Moravian Church but also from the somewhat superficially imposed Moravian "culture."

Never did the Moravians attempt to accommodate their missionary program to the Indians' experience, and seldom did they attempt to prepare their charges for the inevitable contacts with English-speaking whites. The missionaries had only one solution to the problem of conflicting cultures: Germanize (or Moravianize) the Indians, keep them together in the mission community, and—when necessary—move the community to a more remote location. When the mission at New Fairfield, Ontario, finally closed, the Delawares remaining in the village had, to all intents and purposes, abandoned the Moravian Church, and such of them as acknowledged an ecclesiastical affiliation had become either Anglicans or Methodists. Mrs. Gray clearly indicates (p. 332) that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Moravian emphasis was on "missionary work" rather than "church extension" and that by the time the Moravians became conscious of themselves as a "denomination" (although they still regard themselves as a "fellowship" as well as a "denomination")



the opportunity for "church extension" had passed forever.

GLENN WEAVER

*Catawba College*

*The Frontier Camp Meeting, Religion's Harvest Time.* By CHARLES A. JOHNSON. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1955. ix + 325 pages. \$5.00.

Nothing is easier than to write a gay and amusing book about that institution of the American frontier which was known as the camp meeting, and to document the narrative with eye-witness descriptions which give the whole a semblance of historical objectivity while leaving the impression that the leaders of the camp meetings were a set of ridiculous fanatics and the attending crowds about equally divided between weak-minded persons in the grip of primitive emotions and dissolute sinners exploiting the opportunity for loose living. Such accounts have been written. There is no doubt about the abundance of authentic material illustrating one or another of these aspects of many camp meetings. But selecting out this kind of material and dwelling upon it to the exclusion of everything else is not writing history.

In contrast with this method, Mr. Johnson writes as a responsible historian, neither omitting the more sensational and even disreputable features, nor emphasizing them disproportionately. The camp meeting was a social phenomenon of the frontier. It expressed the manners and morals of pioneer people in the midwest and south, which ran the full gamut from the lowest to the highest but as a whole were never as bad as the New Englander, Timothy Dwight the elder, said they were nor as noble as pious fancy sometimes paints them. It ministered to the gregariousness of lonely people living in widely scattered villages or on isolated farms. It was a manifestation, peculiar to its time and place, of the ageless and universal truth that

religion is one of the interests that men cultivate together and that it sometimes draws them into great assemblies in which individual religious experience is intensified and directed by the sharing of a common experience. One of the earliest scientific books on the psychology of religion was Davenport's *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals*. There are ample data to justify that title. The camp meeting was also built around certain theological ideas and presuppositions concerning the nature of man and the meaning of process of "salvation", which, if not primitive, were at least untouched by any influences of modern thought. But the motivation and the message of the camp meeting contained so much of the universal and permanent that any treatment of it as merely an amusing manifestation of frontier crudity and fanaticism is absurdly superficial.

Mr. Johnson takes his subject seriously and treats it respectfully, as one would suspect from his subtitle. "From Cane Ridge to Chatauqua" would not be too comprehensive a title in view of the coverage from the inception of the camp meeting, through its changing patterns, to the emergence of more sophisticated forms of *al fresco* religious and cultural manifestations having a genetic connection with the camp meeting but without what the present generation would call its crude frontier characteristics. The emphasis is upon: (a) the strictly frontier aspect of the camp meeting, which was also the first decade of the 19th century, when Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists participated in the same meetings in generous disregard of denominational distinctions; and (b) the next and more enduring phase when it had become a distinctively Methodist institution.

The author does indeed begin a little back of Cane Ridge (1801), but he cannot go far back of it, for the evangelistic fire burst into sudden flame in the form of the camp meeting only a year or two earlier with the beginning of the Great Western Revival in Ten-

nessee and Kentucky. This extraordinary revival with its spectacular "exercises" (falling, jerking, barking, laughing, etc.), culminating at Cane Ridge Presbyterian Church, near Paris, Kentucky, has already been so fully treated by earlier writers that the present author did not need to go into much detail. He probably errs in saying (p. 62) that the Cane Ridge meeting was "largely the work of Barton W. Stone," even though Stone was minister of the church. He certainly errs, at least in nomenclature, in saying (p. 71) that, after the separation of five "revival men" from the Presbyterian Church, "fifteen independent 'Stonite' societies were functioning in Kentucky and southwestern Ohio by 1804," for Stone was not the original leader of this movement nor was his name ever given to it until some years later.

The distinctive value of Mr. Johnson's book is his full, fair and informative discussion of the development of the Methodist camp meeting, its organization and structure, the techniques of its operation, the character and results of its evangelism, its principal leaders, its preaching and its hymnody.

W. E. GARRISON

*University of Houston*

---

*Changing Conceptions of Original Sin: A Study in American Theology Since 1750.* By H. SHELTON SMITH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955. Pp. xi-242. \$3.50.

The ghost of Pelagius—and of Semi-Pelagius no less—has haunted the Church through the centuries; and these goings-on in America during the last two hundred years are the subject of the book at hand, written by the Professor of American Religious Thought at Duke University. Not only because the doctrine of original sin and related questions of anthropology are crucial but also because the interpretation given them reflects the theological predispositions of in-

dividual thinkers, religious movements and even historical epochs, one is very grateful for Professor Smith's survey. He has written a lucid and illuminating book. It will be very useful in courses on American church history and will, no doubt, remain a valuable work of reference for a long time to come.

A brief summary indicates the scope of the work. Chapter I, with a minimum of introductory material, is devoted to the "Federal Doctrine of Original Sin" in colonial America; Chapter II to the criticism of Federal views framed by John Taylor of Norwich and two Americans, Experience and Jonathan Mayhew, as well as with Jonathan Edwards' defense of "the great Christian doctrine." Chapter III recounts the controversy that embroiled two other American liberals, Samuel Webster and Charles Chauncy, and their assailant, Peter Clark. Chapter IV contains a hurried review of the Edwardsian successors (Hopkins, Emmons, and Dwight), then turns to the "Unitarian challenge" laid down by Channing and to the long debate between Leonard Woods and Henry Ware. Chapters V and VI are devoted to Nathaniel William Taylor and his New Haven cohorts as they stand off Andrews Norton on the left and Joseph Harvey, Bennet Tyler, and Gardner Spring on the right. There is also a brief digression on the efforts of Old School Presbyterians to convict Albert Barnes and Lyman Beecher of heresy. Chapter VII presents a sympathetic and well-rounded discussion of Horace Bushnell that recalls Professor Smith's excellent earlier work on *Faith and Nurture* (Scribners, 1941). Chapter VIII reviews, one by one, an array of representative advocates of the "New Theology": Theodore T. Munger, Newman Smyth, George A. Gordon, Washington Gladden, Lyman Abbott, Lewis F. Stearns, George Harris, Wm. N. Clarke, and Wm. Adams Brown. The final chapter, on "The Revival of the Idea of the Fall and Original Sin," considers Rauschenbusch, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Tillich.

As may be seen from the foregoing summary, the subject-matter of the book is far more restricted than the title would suggest. Aside from the final chapter, which is in effect more an appendix to the work than an integral chapter, the account deals almost exclusively with New England Congregationalists or with Presbyterians who were reared or educated in that milieu. Little or no attention is paid to the large and often profound contributions made by Presbyterians, Lutherans, German Reformed, and Episcopalians—not to mention the European thinkers (other than John Taylor) whose thought was often being reflected in America. This restriction, to be sure, is self-imposed; and a more descriptive title would have cleared things up. A number of other questions of scope and methodology, however, do seem to merit certain brief remarks.

The first has to do with internal balance and emphasis. Notwithstanding the Calvinistic background of every man and the Congregationalism of most of the men considered in the volume, neither St. Augustine nor Calvin nor the Puritan synthesis itself is more than cursorily limned. Only a scant eight pages are devoted to Edwards, despite his having written the single most important American contribution on the subject and provided the point of departure for many of the other men here considered. The great Edwardsian successors, Bellamy, Hopkins, Emmons, Dwight, and Park, are treated with even greater brevity; and the Scriptural exegetes, like Moses Stuart, are scarcely mentioned. The effect of these omissions is that we almost have *King Lear* without Lear and his daughters.

My second remark pertains to the author's disinclination (except in Chapters VII and IX) to set ideas on man and sin in their dogmatic and philosophic context. Edwards' doctrine of sin and the Fall, for example, is so stripped of its metaphysical supports that it seems almost a theological curiosity. This likewise tends to be true of the chapter on the "New Theology," where the decision to discuss

separately each of nine similar and largely derivative thinkers made it virtually impossible to elucidate the organizing principles and philosophical background of Liberalism itself. As a result the whole enterprise of these theologians seems unduly superficial and irrelevant. The reader is not given a proper appreciation either of the difficulties they faced or of the constructive legacy they left to twentieth-century theology.

Thirdly, Professor Smith's decision to make the book less an exposition of doctrines held than a narrative of controversies conducted works an injustice on many men by emphasizing the combative rather than the constructive elements of their thought. As a result we feel the heat more often than we see the light. With regard to Taylor and the New Haven theology this is especially true.

Fourthly, the avoidance of any discussion of the social and intellectual ethos in which these violent words on sin were spoken deprives the story of its natural dynamics. Not only are the tensions between "Orthodox" theology and many new currents of religious and secular thought not examined but the peculiar relationship of the doctrine of original sin (of all doctrines!) to nineteenth-century American hopes and ideals is not illuminated. Even very brief consideration of certain literary treatments of these themes (e.g., by Hawthorne, Melville, or Harriet Beecher Stowe) could have done much to provide this dimension to the account. As things stand, however, the deep and harassing problems of genetic explanation have been evaded.

My final comment, or question, may in some sense be a summation of the foregoing remarks. I would ask whether Professor Smith's conception of the main drift of American theology between 1750 and 1900 is not too much simplified by his narrowing of his focus to a small and easily defined quarter of American church-life. Presbyterianism as a whole did not move so smoothly except in certain urban centers. What of the Hodges, father and

son, to mention but two men in one branch of that denomination? Mercersburg, too, was of quite another spirit—as were its sharpest critics. Nor was W. N. Clarke a spokesman for most Baptists in the United States of his day. Lutheranism was growing rapidly during these decades, but with an increasing and ever more profoundly rooted confessionalism. Inspired by the Catholic revival, Episcopalianism was moving away from the Enlightenment rationalism of Bishop White and the days when the Athanasian creed was struck from the Prayer Book. What, indeed, of the Evangelical Church whence came the Niebuhrs? In short, may we not ask whether the departure from historic theology—and therefore the return—was as sharply defined a matter as this book would suggest?

To close this review with the customary return to minutiae, one could wonder if the statement that Edwards A. Park was a “devoted Hopkinsian” should not be qualified. Perhaps, too, the immense influence attributed to John Taylor of Norwich could be questioned on the grounds that both he and his successors were part of a larger movement which drew its inspiration from diverse sources, many of them not theological. In points of factual detail the work seems to be uniformly accurate and precise. The book is indexed. There is no bibliography, but footnotes provide an excellent guide to much relevant primary and secondary literature.

SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM  
*Yale University.*

---

*The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century.* By R. W. B. LEWIS. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955. ix, 205 pp. \$5.50.

It was a coincidence fortunate for both reader and reviewer that this study of “the American Adam” should appear almost simultaneously with H. Shelton Smith’s *Changing Conceptions*

of *Original Sin* (see review immediately above). Both works emphasize the importance to American thought of the inter-related problems of sin and eschatology. Yet never did two books deal with the same general problem more differently!

Mr. Lewis is concerned “with the beginnings and the first tentative outlines of a native American mythology.” He conceives of our “novelists and poets, as well as essayists, critics, historians and preachers” as engaged in a broad “cultural conversation” or philosophic dialogue whose aim was to articulate “a comprehensive view of life.” The image that crystallized this intellectual ferment was that of the “authentic American as a figure of heroic innocence and vast potentialities, poised at the start of a new history.” The author feels, moreover, that there is a “story” which animates this great, culture-constituting debate, and because America, unlike ancient Rome, had no unified expression of the story or myth, it becomes Mr. Lewis’s purpose to “disentangle . . . the emergent American myth . . . out of an assortment of essays, poems, stories, histories, and sermons.” The essence of this story is the vision of life and history as just beginning in America, of the American experience, indeed, as a kind of “divinely granted second chance for the human race.” “Our national birth,” declaimed the *Democratic Review* in 1839, “. . . separates us from the past and connects us with the future only.” Naturally enough a Bible-reading generation identified the hero of this great American myth with Adam before the Fall, a type of the creator, innocent, with history before him. Not insignificantly the final works of both Hawthorne and Melville, *The Marble Faun* and *Billie Budd*, make “literal use of the story of Adam and the Fall of Man.”

In delineating the dramatic action (dialogue is hardly the word) which forms the subject of his book, Mr. Lewis takes his terms from Emerson. The champions of the optimistic and future-oriented conception become the

Party of Hope; the defenders of traditional views, the Party of Memory. A third group, consisting of those who "inspected the opposed tendencies and then arrived at a fresh understanding of the nature of tradition and America's practical involvement with the past," he places in a Party of Irony. This third party, which goes beyond Emerson's categories and terminology, is represented best by Hawthorne and Melville and, perhaps, the elder Henry James. Mr. Lewis finds its "curious, ambivalent, off-beat kind of traditionalism" to be at times "agonizingly contemporary."

In this dialectical context Lewis considers the thought of a succession of nineteenth-century America's most exciting minds. The first chapter, "The Case Against the Past," traces Jefferson's notion of the "sovereign present" in many literary transmutations from Hawthorne's fantasy, "Earth's Holocaust," to Thomas Skidmore's *The Rights of Man to Property*, with especially extended treatment given to the analysis of Thoreau's *Walden* as a "rebirth ritual." Then follows a chapter on "The New Adam" in which Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes and Walt Whitman are studied. The third chapter on "The Fortunate Fall" wherein the elder James, Bushnell, and (briefly) Jonathan Edwards are treated is at once one of the most insightful and most inadequate in the book. Insightful is its effective commentary on James, particularly regarding his use of the ancient theme of the "Fortunate Fall" which is expressed in the medieval hymn sung during the Holy Saturday mass: *O felix culpa! quae talem et tantum meruit habere redemptorem* (O happy sin! to deserve so great a redeemer). In connection with Bushnell, however, a major shortcoming of the volume appears. It is presaged by an opening remark that Bushnell, "in so far as he would be known at all, was to be known as a sort of genial Jonathan Edwards. . ." And this statement is shortly followed by another: that Bushnell "gave the soundest analysis of his age, for those who felt that

Adamism was both the pre-eminent and the most dangerous illusion in contemporary thought." What would Bennet Tyler think of *that* remark! Now it is all well and good to rescue Bushnell from the obloquy which has fallen on him as the father of the "New Theology" and to reemphasize his profound concern with the Gospel of the Church. It is well, too, to dwell upon his intellectual breadth and disinclination "to show the world how small a plot of ground we can all stand on," but to regard him as *the* nineteenth-century spokesman for the so-called Party of Memory is to create a serious distortion of the American dialogue.

Part II on "The Narrative Image" consists of four chapters. The first, entitled "The Fable of Critics," is a consideration of conflicting views about the need for and possibilities of an American literature. The second is a critical essay on Charles Brockden Brown's *Arthur Mervyn*, Cooper's *Deerslayer*, and Robert Montgomery Bird's *Nick of the Woods* in which very important groundwork is laid for the two central chapters of the book, which follow: "The Return into Time: Hawthorne" and "Melville: The Apotheosis of Adam," the second of these closing with a few remarks on Henry James, especially his last completed novel, *The Golden Bowl*. In these men the Party of Irony finds its truest and greatest voices: they above all "wanted both to undermine and to bolster the image of the American as a new Adam."

Part III consists of two chapters. The first, "The Function of History," deals primarily with two of America's epic historians. In George Bancroft we are made to see quite clearly the "studied demonstration in historical terms of the validity of the hopeful legend, the legend of the second chance." He was preoccupied with the new birth of freedom in America. "[His] historical temperament was undeviatingly innocent." In Francis Parkman, on the other hand, we find "the story of loss, rather than gain.



It was the loss of a world in which the possibility of tragedy was central. And for Parkman tragedy revealed and tested the authentic greatness of the human spirit."

The final chapter, entitled "The Real Presence," discusses a curious combination of men who belonged in a loose way to the Party of Memory, and Theodore Parker who is characterized as a "hope-affirming Yankee Luther." Parker is apparently included to provide contrast, for no other thoroughly liberal theologian is represented in the entire volume; but his thought contributes little to Lewis's conception of the dialogue except to provide an illustration for Emerson's dictum that the true religious party was "falling away from the Church nominal" and joining the "soldiery of dissent." In this rôle Parker was certainly in the Party of Hope. In the other camp are Taylor Lewis, described as "an irascible professor of Old Testament at Union College," and Caleb Sprague Henry, an Episcopalian with Transcendental leanings, who are discussed in passing as critics of Bancroft's fervent optimism. Two other men who abandoned the Party of Hope are treated at greater length. Orestes Brownson, whose search for communion ultimately led him to Roman Catholicism, shares with Parker the central place in this chapter. Then follows an account of James Russell Lowell's reentry into the Old World tradition and his consequent discovery of the vast individual enrichment to be gained "through conscious participation in the full flow of history."

An Epilogue on "The Contemporary Situation" remarks on "Adam as Hero in the Age of Containment" and stresses "the indestructible vitality of the Adamic vision of life" by showing its recurrence in *Huckleberry Finn*, *The Great Gatsby*, and more recently

in the writings of Ralph Ellison, J. D. Salinger, and Saul Bellow.

Such then is the "dialogue," and even the reader of this brief review must perceive that Mr. Lewis has touched upon a vital theme. Let it be said further that he has executed his task with an imaginativeness, breadth, and felicity that a review tends to conceal. It is undeniably the kind of book that invites many passing quarrels (I, for example, am not satisfied with his interpretation of Melville's *Billie Budd* and I wonder if Lowell did, in fact, leave the hopeful "soldiery of dissent" in 1851) but it is also the kind of book that provokes reevaluation of our tradition in both its secular and religious aspects. It is both an important and a useful book. The author, to be sure, has not developed the theme fully: for one thing, the basso continuo of the orthodox tradition (against which Holmes, for instance, was so directly reacting) is missing. The "bleak," "immobile," or "irascible" thing that passes in its name is inadequate. But Mr. Lewis has, nevertheless, very effectively witnessed again to the remarkable degree to which the story of American literature—like the story of American philosophy—comes within the perimeter of Church history. And at the same time his study constitutes a warning to the ecclesiastical and doctrinal historian that the American grappling with the issues of faith and destiny cannot be conceived in simply formal or institutional terms without distortion.

The volume is indexed but there is no bibliography. Primary works used are, of course, adequately identified in the text but references to relevant secondary material are sparse. The author is an Associate Professor of English at Rutgers University.

SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM  
Yale University



.  
l  
y  
s  
e  
s  
o  
f  
-  
l  
s  
l  
y  
e  
-  
r  
-  
.  
e  
o  
n  
o  
.  
;  
;  
-  
n  
e  
e  
e  
s  
-  
y  
-  
e  
f  
d  
s  
s  
l  
n  
t  
e  
f  
r



